REPORT RESUMES

ED 016 084 VT 003 664
FOLLOW-UP OF MDTA E AND D PROJECT CONDUCTED BY TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE.
BY- JOHNSON, LOUISE A.
BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.,WASH.,D.C.
REPORT NUMBER BSSR-369 PUB DATE MAY 67
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.08 100P.

DESCRIPTORS- SOCIOECONOMIC BACKGROUND, INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS, FOLLOWUP STUDIES, RURAL POPULATION, *ADULT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, *ADULT BASIC EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE, *ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, *NEGROES, MALES, RECRUITMENT, JOB PLACEMENT, PROGRAM DESCRIPTIONS, *PROGRAM EVALUATION, COLLEGE PROGRAMS, EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS, MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT, POVERTY PROGRAMS, VOCATIONAL COUNSELING, MDTA PROGRAMS, TUSKEGEE, ALABAMA, TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE,

AN EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECT DESIGNED TO PROVIDE BASIC EDUCATION, JOB TRAINING, COUNSELING, AND JOB PLACEMENT FOR 180 NEGRO MALES WAS CONDUCTED BETWEEN JUNE 1, 1964, AND MAY 31, 1965, AT TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE, A PREDOMINANTLY NEGRO PRIVATE COLLEGE IN ALABAMA. THE TRAINEES WERE BETWEEN THE AGES OF 16 AND 50, RURAL RESIDENTS, HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS, UNSKILLED, UNEMPLOYED OR UNDEREMPLOYED, BELOW THE EIGHTH GRADE LEVEL IN READING ABILITY, AND EARNED UNDER $1,200 ANNUALLY. FOLLOWUP DATA WAS PROVIDED BY INTERVIEWS WITH 127 TRAINEES, PROJECT STAFF, AND COMMUNITY LEADERS. THE CONCLUSIONS INCLUDED (1) THE OUTCOME OF THE PROJECT, FOR MANY TRAINEES, WAS A HIGH LEVEL OF OCCUPATIONAL COMPETENCE WHICH WAS REFLECTED IN THEIR HIGH RATES OF EMPLOYMENT, TRAINING-RELATED EMPLOYMENT, AND AFTER-TRAINING WAGE LEVELS, (2) THE DIFFICULTY IN RECRUITING THE HARD-CORE UNEMPLOYED WAS PARTLY ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE STRONG DEPENDENCY RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE VERY POOR AND THEIR FARM LANDLORDS, (3) THE PROJECT STAFF WOULD HAVE BENEFITED FROM MORE TIME TO RECRUIT AND HIRE TEACHERS WHO KNEW THE PROBLEMS OF DEPRIVED ADULTS, (4) THE PROJECT WOULD HAVE BEEN MORE EFFECTIVE HAD TRAINEES BEEN GIVEN FINANCIAL SUPPORT DURING THE PLACEMENT PHASE, AND (5) THE DIVISION OF PROJECT RESPONSIBILITIES BETWEEN THE DIRECTOR AND ASSISTANT DIRECTOR WAS HIGHLY EFFECTIVE AND COULD SERVE AS A MODEL FOR SIMILAR PROJECTS. IT WAS RECOMMENDED THAT CONTRACTS BE WRITTEN AND PROGRAMS DESIGNED TO PROVIDE SOME FLEXIBILITY IN LENGTH OF TRAINING TIME, SELF-SELECTION OF TRAINING AREA BE CONSIDERED, SOME PROVISION BE MADE FOR TRAINEES TO ACQUIRE A WORK RECORD, AND AT LEAST TWO PERSONS BE WORKING ON JOB DEVELOPMENT FROM THE TIME THE PROJECT BEGINS. (ET)

"Special Manpower Volume"

ED016084

BSSR

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

VT003664

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FOLLOW-UP OF MDTA E & D PROJECT CONDUCTED BY TUSKEGEE INSTITUTE.

Submitted to:

Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
U. S. Department of Labor
(Contract 83-08-03)

Louise A. Johnson

May, 1967

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH, INC.
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

BSSR:369

FOREWORD

This report is one of a series of reports on each of eight experimental and demonstration training projects followed up by the Bureau of Social Science Research under Contract Number 83-08-03 with the Office of Manpower, Automation and Training (now the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research) of the U. S. Department of Labor. The eight training projects were conducted by seven institutions scattered from Michigan to Florida. Six of the institutions were considered to be "predominately Negro" colleges: Bluefield State College (West Virginia), Florida A & M University, Morgan State College (Maryland), A & T College of North Carolina, Tennessee A & I State University, and Tuskegee Institute (Alabama). The seventh institution was the Job Training Center in Lansing sponsored by the Michigan Catholic Conference. An over-all report will pool the experiences of the several projects and consider their implications for future manpower development programs.

The follow-up studies had three general objectives:

1. to document that the target populations--individuals with especially difficult employment problems--were serviced, that they are trainable and that these institutions can train them;

2. to document whether the training may have affected the employment situation of the trainees: that "trainability" leads to "employability"; and,

3. to identify components of the training projects and community characteristics which may have contributed to the training and employment outcomes.

The "ideal" research design called for "before-after" studies. The timing of the award of the follow-up contract by OMAT to BSSR precluded the execution in its pure form of this design. The contract was awarded after one project had terminated, four others had begun, and the remaining three were about to begin. In all reports the "before" data are based on retrospective observations.

The study plan called for the integration of three distinct bodies of data into detailed reports on the individual projects. The starting point for the analysis was a series of discussions with members of the project staff at each of the training centers. These discussions yielded detailed information about the actual conduct of each project, its goals and methods. From these meetings and discussions it was possible to assemble pertinent histories for each project. Because of the method employed, the central perspective of each history was that of the persons charged with the conduct of the individual projects: the administrators, the instructors and counselors, and officials of the public agencies who may have cooperated in the conduct of the projects. In addition, records which helped to clarify the goals and conduct of the projects were made available to BSSR by OMAT.

This administrative perspective was broadened by a second body of data concerning special conditions in each of the areas where training was given. Discussions about local factors that would affect the outcome of the training projects were held with civic and business leaders in each area by members of BSSR's Study Team. From these discussions information was obtained concerning employment conditions in each area, hiring practices and preferences, skill requirements, etc. Thus, we knew a great deal about these projects and their setting, but the information we had was from the perspectives of the project personnel and people in what might be called the "power structure" of the local community.

To round out the picture of the projects, it was deemed necessary to view them from the perspective of the people they were designed to serve. This information was obtained through personal interviews by specially trained interviewers. The sampling plan called for interviewing all trainees and a sample of persons who applied for but who did not begin training. Interviewing took place from six to twelve months after the completion of training. The respondents were asked about their personal and economic situations at the time they applied for training in addition to their experiences with the training project and their current situation.

In most interviewing areas no experienced interviewers were available; pools of potential interviewers were formed through the recruitment efforts of BSSR field directors. Negro school teachers were the primary source in most areas. In all, more than one hundred and fifty interviewing recruits passed "screening," passed training, and conducted one or more interviews.

Interviewers underwent intensive training by BSSR field directors to locate the respondents whose addresses, although verified by the Post Office, were up to two years old--and to conduct the lengthy follow-up interview. Where respondents were concentrated, interviewers could be supervised locally; where respondents were scattered, interviewers were supervised by mail and phone from BSSR in Washington, D. C. In either case, all interviews were subjected to quality control procedures designed to yield a high level of completeness and consistency among responses. As a result item response rates are extremely high for all "critical" items in the schedules.

Approximately 2400 persons who applied for training at any of the projects were to be interviewed; completed interviews were obtained from about 1700, a response rate of over 70 per cent. About three-fourths of those who began training at any project were interviewed; the rate ranged among the projects from 53 per cent to 96 per cent. Response rates for those who applied for but who did not begin training were somewhat lower. The latter group, it should be noted, could provide a basis for evaluating the recruitment and selection procedures of the projects and, under special circumstances, could serve also as a control group with respect to the effectiveness of training.

The authorship of each individual report was assigned to a permanent staff member of BSSR who also was responsible for the analysis of the several bodies of information available about a project, but each report is also based upon the research contributions of many staff members of BSSR. The studies were under the over-all coordination of Dr. Robert T. Bower, Director, BSSR, with the assistance of Laure M. Sharp, Senior Research Associate. Leslie J. Silverman, Research Associate, was the Study Director, and, together with Mrs. Bettye K. Eidson and Miss N. March Hoffman, Research Analysts, designed the studies. The BSSR Study Team consisted of Dr. Frank Cotton, Mississippi State University; Dr. Lewis Jones, Fisk University;* and Dr. Charles Grosser, New York University. Field operations for the trainee follow-up in Alabama were directed by Ben L. Owens. Dr. Samuel Lyerly designed the statistical procedures used in the various reports, and Richard Jones provided data processing consultation.

---

*Dr. Jones was not asked to participate in the Tuskegee Institute research because of his occasional position there. He is in no way responsible either for the observations or the conclusions contained in this report.

Frank Davis supervised the coding operations and Miss Megan McLaughlin supervised the interviewers and the quality control operation. Donald Goldstein was the programmer. Miss Diantha Stevenson and Miss Angeles Buenaventura also provided valuable assistance.

We are grateful to many individuals throughout the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor who assisted us. Within OMPER, Mr. Robert Lafaso, our first project officer, and Mr. L. B. Wallerstein, who succeeded him, provided valuable guidance and met our requests in a most satisfactory manner.

We are grateful also to the directors and staffs of the training projects who cheerfully underwent so many hours of interviewing by BSSR staff. The helpfulness of employers of trainees, officials of state and local Employment Security Commission offices, and State Education Agencies is acknowledged and appreciated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD iii

Chapter

I. THE COLLEGE 1

Tuskegee Institute 1
The Proposal 3
Planning and Administration 7

II. RECRUITMENT OF TRAINEES 13

Initiation of Recruitment 13
Selection of Trainees 18
Trainees and Applicants Compared 22
Economic Situation of Trainees at Different Educational Levels 27
Summary and Conclusions 32

III. THE TRAINING PROGRAM 33

The Basic Education Program 34
Job Training 37
Evaluation of Trainee Performance 40
Counseling 41
Cultural Enrichment 45

IV. TRAINEE RESPONSE TO THE TRAINING PROGRAM 46

Choice of Training Occupation 46
Trainee Evaluation of Job Training 50
Trainee Evaluation of Basic Education 55
Residence on Campus 57
The Trainees' "Worries" While in Training 59
Dropouts 61
Summary and Conclusions 61

V. JOB DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT 64

Summary and Conclusions 83

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 85

Recommendations 89

I. THE COLLEGE

The MDTA Experimental and Demonstration project sponsored by Tuskegee Institute was one of several college-based projects conducted in the southeastern United States during 1964 and 1965. Their common purpose was to find effective ways of reaching, recruiting, training, and placing disadvantaged rural adults. Because of the particular spatial problems presented by this population to agencies which wished to include them in Federally-financed retraining programs and the lack of existing comprehensive facilities, a solution was sought outside conventional Employment Security-Vocational Education channels. It was thought that by providing centralized, in-residence training facilities these colleges might meet the total needs of this scattered population. With their existing administration bases and under-utilized resources, typically in agricultural and vocational training spheres, these colleges might be well suited to developing the manpower potential of the disadvantaged rural population.

Tuskegee Institute

All of the predominately Negro colleges which accepted E & D contracts from OMAT have been subject to strong pressures toward change in recent years. The survival of predominately Negro public 4-year colleges as 4-year colleges in the South is currently being challenged as contiguous, predominately white institutions become increasingly desegregated. Many of these colleges have been--or will be--defined by the states as redundant. Tuskegee, as a private institution, has been freer from these pressures than most. Subject to fewer constraints than a state supported institution, it seems better able to determine its own future and to develop a new program for itself than the public institutions.

Tuskegee has been attempting to upgrade itself and to become recognized as more than merely a well-known, predominately Negro college. Competent persons in the field of higher education, knowledgeable about the school, were asked by BSSR to evaluate the college. They judged the quality of the chemistry and microbiology staffs, in particular, to be high; other physical science fields and the social sciences were rated as weak. In this respect Tuskegee does not differ from most southern colleges--predominately white or predominately Negro--which are characterized by considerable variation in quality among their departments.

One indication of change at Tuskegee is derived from its periodic reports to the U. S. Office of Education of enrollments and degrees granted. A comparison of its reports for the 1954-55 and the 1964-65 academic years shows a shift in degrees granted from some of the more traditional vocational fields to the arts and sciences as well as increasing numbers of graduate degrees. At the end of the ten-year period fewer degrees were granted in agriculture, industrial arts education, and home economics; more baccalaureate degrees were granted in the other education fields, English and journalism, and the social and biological sciences.[1] Finally, during the first term of 1961-62, Tuskegee reported no enrollment in less-than-baccalaureate level curriculums, indicating that it did not offer less-than-college level work.[2]

---

[1] U. S. Office of Education: Earned Degrees Conferred. (See the years indicated) U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

[2] U. S. Office of Education: Comprehensive Report on Enrollment in Higher Education, 1961-62. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

Tuskegee's opportunity to apply for an E & D contract came during a time of change, of shifts away from vocational fields and long after the time when Tuskegee directly served the needs of the institutionally isolated, poor Negro.[3]

The Proposal

The college-based E & D program seems to have been brought to Tuskegee's attention by a former faculty member working for the Federal Government in Washington. He arranged for OMAT officials to visit the campus. They were impressed; the Mechanical Industries facilities seem to have impressed them most. The Dean of Agriculture and the Director of Mechanical Industries were invited to attend the OMAT-sponsored Norfolk Conference for Negro college officials and brought back a favorable report. A draft proposal for an Area Redevelopment Administration training project[4] was retrieved from the files and seems to have been the starting point for the OMAT proposal. An OMAT project officer suggested to Tuskegee that the proposal be drafted with the aid of a person from the Norfolk project.

---

[3] It has been many years since the Tuskegee mobile bus toured rural areas instructing Negroes in improving their working habits, health and living conditions. More recently, the Institute had engaged in nursing research with culturally deprived mothers, had sponsored farmers' conferences for Negro farmers in the state and had operated a number of extension programs directed toward the needs of rural Negroes. The persons who applied to be trained at the E & D project do not seem aware of the Tuskegee tradition. Fewer than one-fourth of the persons who applied for training reported to a BSSR interviewer that Tuskegee "had done something to help people who didn't have jobs or who didn't make much money." Of the minority who did cite something, over half pointed to scholarship aid for poor college students; job training per se was cited by only 4 of the 240 persons interviewed. It is not surprising, then, that over 70 per cent of the respondents reported being "surprised" when they heard that Tuskegee "was interested in helping people who didn't have jobs or farm workers who didn't make much money."

[4] This proposal had allowed for up to three months of basic education instruction. One Tuskegee educator who had followed the progressive unfolding of Federal retraining legislation opined that three months was insufficient for remedying the deficiencies of "disadvantaged" adults.

Such a person did, in turn, rewrite the ARA proposal in OMAT form. With Tuskegee representatives, he surveyed campus facilities to select training occupations to propose. Among the training occupations rejected for which Tuskegee had facilities were nurse-aide, printing, and landscaping. The last named was rejected because one of the participants in the proposal drafting process was knowledgeable about the "occupation"; from his own business experience he knew that there "wasn't much of any kind of future in the landscape business except for the owner and perhaps one man working for him."[5]

The prospective project was not attractive to all segments of the Tuskegee community. The arguments of those who opposed acceptance included the necessity for cutting ties to the past as typified by Booker T. Washington, the need to concentrate resources for the push to excellence, the assessment of the social science and education faculties as less than adequate for the training task, and the "dangers," real or assumed, expected to result from the presence on campus of uneducated, poor males. Among those in the Tuskegee community who favored acceptance were professional adult educators, "humanitarians," and some of the persons connected with the slack facilities which would be utilized to provide training. Indications are that one or more members of the Board of Trustees urged acceptance upon the administration. Others who may have opposed acceptance of the contract were asked for their advice only after the contract had been signed.

Tuskegee justified accepting the contract on the grounds that the E & D project presented a research opportunity. And, several graduate students did write theses based upon problems and data generated by the project. Tuskegee conducted project-related research to an extent greater than any of the other college-based E & D projects followed up by BSSR. Further, the research activity at Tuskegee tended to be under the direction and control of college staff. At the other colleges research either was not done at all or done under the direction of faculty from other, predominately white, colleges.

---

[5] State Employment Service officials reported to BSSR that demand for persons trainees in the four occupational areas had been established on a statewide basis. However, the project staff reported to BSSR that it had no first hand knowledge that the Alabama Employment Security Commission had conducted a job demand survey.

At least one Tuskegee staff member submitted to OMAT a proposal to conduct research related to manpower considerations in general. Briefly, he had noted that the "hardest core" rural Negro failed to respond to the E & D recruitment effort. He believed that information about the project had reached this group, but that the training opportunity was not sufficiently attractive to them to stimulate an affirmative response. He proposed to study the apparent unattractiveness of rehabilitation efforts generally to this "hardest core." The proposal was not funded.

There seemed to have been conflict within OMAT, back in 1964 and 1965, over whether to encourage the Negro colleges to undertake training only or also to whet their appetites for manpower-related research. Among those who leaned toward the latter view there was a lack of consensus about funding. Some believed that OMAT contracts carried enough "fat" to support research without additional funding; others at OMAT believed that the colleges should be encouraged to apply for additional funds for extra-project manpower research. Some OMAT officials looked upon the college-based E & D programs as one means to increase the supply of college faculty interested in general manpower problems. However, the means by which the supply would be affected were not clarified.

The lack of a consistent policy at OMAT resulted in Tuskegee's having a difficult time justifying acceptance of the contract. The training money was their only incentive to return, in part, to their bygone and unlamented concern with vocational training; the financial means to upgrade their social science faculty by permitting it to conduct extensive, manpower research was not forthcoming.[6]

An educational justification for accepting the contract might have been found by Tuskegee; suggestions were made to the administration on at least two occasions. One person had proposed that Tuskegee's E & D project experience might serve as a basis for the design of training guidelines for less experienced persons who would staff other projects in the state of Alabama. Another suggestion, made independently by a BSSR representative, was that Tuskegee consider a formal degree program in the training of the disadvantaged adult. The destiny of neither suggestion is known to BSSR. We do know that an OMAT project officer did not display much interest in these suggestions; they did not fall within his department's segment of the administratively-fragmented Federal manpower development program. Nonetheless, the Tuskegee experience, and the experience accumulated at all other projects followed up by BSSR, point strongly to the need for teacher training and curriculum development for these manpower development programs.

The proposal called for recruitment from a target population of persons presumed to have the following characteristics: inability to qualify for regular MDTA training because of low level of literacy, intellectual performance at about the fourth grade level, possession of few or no marketable skills, histories of unemployment or underemployment as heads of primarily rural families with incomes of less than $1200 per year, and otherwise psychologically and socially deprived. Those selected were to be mainly from the state of Alabama and between the ages of 19 and 50. A change in OMAT directives while recruitment was in progress lowered the minimum eligible age to 16 and opened the program to rural residents in general, farm or nonfarm. All planning was to take into account the special needs of these prospective trainees.

---

[6] The project brought in a research consultant, a former staff member, to organize the research. His work was with the project and not with interested social science faculty.

Planning and Administration

The completed proposal was approved on January 17, 1964. The budget was over $800,000. Tuskegee reports that its first advance payment under the OMAT contract was not received until March. The college had advanced monies to the project until March.

In planning the conduct of the program, the project staff consulted with the Vocational Education office in Montgomery about the number of teachers and the kind of counseling that should be provided. Because they felt that a good college teacher is not necessarily a good teacher of culturally deprived adults, the staff sought teachers who had taught similar groups before or who had other knowledge of the special problems involved.

The project staff stated that it was prepared to recruit skills instructors anywhere in the country. The instructors whom they hired to teach brick masonry, carpentry, and meat processing had been educated in and had had practical experience in their respective specialties. They were rated as highly skilled by the BSSR Study Team. The project failed to locate a farm equipment repair instructor with comparable skill and fell back upon a soon-to-be retired professor at Tuskegee. His knowledge of the current state of the art was deficient; for example, he could provide no instruction in diesel engines. Of the basic education staff, the communications skills instructors were experienced in the teaching of deprived adults, but the mathematics instructors, both Tuskegee graduate students, were not effective teachers.

The training staff was organized as follows. There was one instructor for each of the four occupational training fields; a fifth individual served as shop supervisor and area coordinator. Three of the five basic education instructors taught communications skills and two taught mathematics; one from each group served as area coordinator.

A full-time counselor, whose previous experience had been in a prison, was soon fired because of his harsh attitude toward the trainees. It appears that no full-time counselor served the project from about October, 1964 until February, 1965,[7] when two women counselors were brought on to the staff. One of them also served as a job developer beginning in April or May of that year. Another job developer position was capably filled by the younger brother of a Tuskegee administrator.

The project's top administration was not continuous. The first Associate Director (in charge of operations) was the Dean of one of the schools at Tuskegee. He was not an adult educator and, as a consequence, had no particular basis for modifying the project as it unfolded. Nor did he accept the spirit of the contract, that the college would perform all functions implied in an E & D project. In this instance, OMAT had written $14,865 into the contract for the Alabama Employment Security Commission to do job development, but the state had accepted neither the money nor the function. The first associate also rejected the job development function, citing an educational justification as the raison d'etre for the project. Despite his high position on the campus he was replaced when the project was approximately half completed, probably at the urging or insistence of OMAT, which withheld project funds on the grounds that the project's periodic progress reports were unacceptable.[8]

---

[7] This fact was known to an OMAT field representative who had visited the project during December, 1964. He urged that additional counselors be added to the staff.

The position of Associate Director was given to another Tuskegee staff member called back from leave; he had previously directed a program which taught illiterates in Macon and surrounding counties to read and write. He was the only professional adult educator directing any of the college-based E & D projects followed up by BSSR and his professionalism showed. So far as we could determine, he saw to it that the total experience offered by the project to the trainees was coordinated. In addition, he completed the integration of the skills training with the basic education and furthered the search for materials suitable to trainees at each level of literacy competence.[9] His tenure seems also to have coincided with a decrease in absenteeism, an increase in trainee morale, a more effective counseling program, and much of the job development effort.

It would be premature to conclude that the utilization of professional adult educators as project administrators will guarantee "successful" training or a high quality of training, but it does appear from an appraisal of projects directed by them that they are more adept than economists, agricultural specialists, or vocational-technical educators at designing or conducting comprehensive training programs for educationally deficient adults. Nor does the usual OMAT practice of assigning basic education consultants merely to assist projects seem to provide as competent and continuous educational administration. The Tuskegee experience with its basic education consultant suggests that such continuous leadership within the project was necessary; the initial curriculum had to be modified, supplemented, and supplanted as the staff gained experience with it.

---

[8] BSSR staff first visited the project in December, 1964 during the period of withheld funds but OMAT had not informed BSSR of the situation. We were not prepared for the cold welcome, nor did the lack of communication augur a productive visit; the Tuskegee staff was understandably suspicious of our work. Hopefully OMPER now does inform follow-up contractors or other researchers of situations likely to affect the conduct of their research.

[9] In his attempts to increase the "horizons" of the trainees he found a cooperative film distributor who made available, without cost, several hundred films and film strips.

The project's organization had much to recommend it as a general model. While the Associate Director served as general administrator, the Director, the Dean of Academic Affairs, was the project's foreign secretary, representing the project to the college and to the state agencies. His time was not charged to the OMAT budget. The project's Associate Director devoted his time solely to the conduct of the project. He could concern himself with all aspects of the comprehensive project, singly and in their interrelatedness. OMAT has involved itself on many occasions in the selection of project administrators at the colleges. It is suggested that insufficient attention may have been given in the selection of administrators to estimates of their technical competence to conduct the training itself.

Training allowances were arranged as follows. The project staff assigned dormitory rooms on campus to half of the trainees: those who lived more than 50 miles from Tuskegee. Those who lived on campus would receive a $25 a week training allowance plus a subsistence of $35 per week, from which they would pay about $60 a month for room, board, and laundry. Those who lived within a radius of 50 miles but not closer than 15 miles were to get the $26 allowance supplemented by a travel allotment not to exceed 10¢ per mile or $5 per day, whichever was less. Those who lived within a radius of 15 miles would get only the $26 weekly allowance.

As a mechanism of control in the dormitories, the two mathematics instructors were assigned to reside with the trainees, one in each of the two dormitories to which trainees were assigned.

Provision was made for resident trainees to eat in the Institute cafeteria. Commuters who brought their lunches could eat in a lunchroom and had access to a snack bar and a reading room during the noon hour. Trainees were fully integrated into campus life.

All of these plans culminated in a schedule of classes to be held five days a week from June 1, 1964 to May 31, 1965. Each day, beginning at 8:00 A. M., each trainee was to attend a 90 minute English class, a 90 minute mathematics class, and a three hour class in an occupational skill. A one hour movie was scheduled for Thursdays, a one hour lecture was given by a guest speaker each Friday morning, and one hour a week was set aside for group counseling.

As one would expect in the conduct of any project, and especially in an experimental and demonstration project operating for the first time, not all of the goals of the project were perfectly achieved. It is the purpose of this report to elaborate on the outline just presented so as to reflect in greater detail the on-going operation of the project and to identify sources of failure and success as well as the level of compliance with the terms of the contract.

First we will report on the actual recruitment procedure and ask whether or not the target population was reached. Then the content of the training program and the response of the trainees to it will be discussed. Last of all we will look at the job development and placement activities and compare the economic situation of the trainees before training to their situation at the time we interviewed them.

The research and evaluation procedures developed by BSSR are outlined in the Foreword to this report.[10]

---

[10] BSSR Interim Report #4 to OMAT (June 30, 1966) details the procedures followed in organizing a personal interview survey of almost 400 Negro men, scattered over the state of Alabama and residing mainly in small towns or rural areas. Over 70 per cent of the trainees, those who began training, and 55 per cent of the applicants, those who applied for but did not begin training, were interviewed.

II. RECRUITMENT OF TRAINEES

Initiation of Recruitment

In January of 1964 efforts were begun to recruit under- or unemployed household heads, 16 to 50 years of age, resident in rural areas of the state of Alabama, with 4th to 8th grade educations and incomes of $1,200 or less, who were desirous of learning a trade. Because of the choice of training occupations, only male recruits were sought for this initial program.

An announcement was sent at that time to the county agricultural agents and state teachers of vocational agriculture, stating that a training program would begin some time between April 1 and May 1, and asking them to submit the names and addresses of prospective applicants. The first mailing produced an applicant pool of 369 persons. Because only a third of the agricultural agents and teachers had responded, a second mailing went out on February 25. The two appeals together produced about 700 names.

On March 2 the project staff notified the prospective applicants that initial contact meetings would be held at several places throughout the state, and invited them to come and meet staff members at the site nearest to their homes. They were also encouraged to bring along friends or neighbors who showed interest in the training program. Through newspaper and radio announcements others were encouraged to attend.

From March 9 to 18, 635 recruits were interviewed at 11 locations. Only three white men responded. In view of the troubled race relations in

Alabama at the time,[11] the staff decided to confine admission to Negroes. Only 377 of these recruits were found to be heads of household and the majority were not farm workers. A third of the 377 had completed high school and almost all had more than a 6th grade education. The staff concluded that many recruits who came for interviews had ignored the statement of eligibility requirements.

After comparing the backgrounds of the recruits to 1960 census data for the state, the project staff decided to postpone the beginning of training until June 1 and to send two local county agents and two members of the Tuskegee faculty on a door-to-door campaign in Macon County to try to discover the reasons for failure to reach those who were most deprived. At the end of this reconnaissance the staff concluded that:

> 1. communications media do not reach the hardcore; personal contact is necessary if one wishes to reach the target population;
> 2. eligible applicants are often unable to enroll because of some aspect of their personal situations. Because of the very limited public assistance in Alabama, few persons are totally unemployed; almost all have some means of subsistence, however occasional and limited, but their economic dependency entails obligations they cannot easily put aside. For example, many were found to be endentured to landlords or storekeepers who had advanced credit in return for the promise to be available to work when needed. Those who received housing as part of an employment agreement could not enroll because their families would be evicted if the head of the household was not available to work. Farm workers were particularly likely to be held back by some such arrangement.[12]

---

[11] Three white applicants were deemed too few to provide for true integration, yet sufficient to generate conflict. A Negro boycott of white businesses had been and still was in effect; the Selma-Montgomery March took place during the project year. The staff assumed a moderate pose with respect to the problem; for example, they refused to allow trainees to participate in the March.

[12] A statement to BSSR by the second Associate Project Director may communicate more clearly the recruitment problem:

> There are two distinct classes of rural people in this area. There are those who try to squeeze out some kind of a subsistence on their own, out of their own little farms and lots. And they have a feeling of independence. And there are those below that group who are exploited by landlords, businessmen, and others. It is the people who are exploited

Project staff members could make a greater effort to reach the poor through personal contact; they could do little about the encumbrances associated with incurred indebtedness.

An explanation for the failure of the county agents and vocational agriculture teachers to produce greater numbers of candidates was provided by Tuskegee faculty members who suggested that because the project did not first clear the request to local agents through district officials, county agents and teachers did not know whether the request was legitimate or "safe." Another explanation was advanced for the failure to reach more disadvantaged persons. The primary recruitment channels utilized by the project do not usually deal with the most disadvantaged. For example, vocational agriculture teachers traditionally follow, we have been told, the practice of selective referrals for "awards" or prizes. It is very probable, according to this explanation, that these sources sought

---

> whom we are looking for or should be looking for. But they have been brainwashed and held in captivity. (What do you have in mind there?) Some of the families who work for these landlords are reluctant even to talk with you, to me, because they have been told by the landlord that we can do nothing here to help them and they are in so much debt to their landlord they are scared to move. These people, in general, are very illiterate . . . . The landlords in certain sections of this county do not give (literacy training) their blessing. They prefer for us not to come on the farm to interview the potential participants of these adult education classes. I was asked in one place to leave when I explained to the landlord what I was trying to do. In this situation you have a saw mill, a cotton farm, and a grocery, and . . . it's a circle in which about 25 families have all of their activities there. They live in shacks on the farm, they work on the saw mill, on the cotton farms, and they spend whatever they get at the grocery. It is all owned by one and the same person. . . . The men work on the farm for between $3 and $5 a day and the women work, in some instances, in the homes of the white people around for $5 a week. We have other situations in the county where they have what you call a 'movable store.' The landlord puts all the kinds of food that he thinks these people want to eat and then he drives around to their homes and delivers the food to them. He collects his money on their pay days. This is owned by the landlord and these are his tenants or his laborers and the shacks they live in belong to him. So he keeps a pretty tight hand on them, he controls the situation and it is pretty difficult to get them out of that setting because their accounts are always far behind.

prospective trainees for the project whom they believed to be most qualified, who would best reflect upon the good judgement of the source.

The hypothesis of selectivity can be examined through BSSR follow-up data. All respondents were asked how they heard about the training program. Of 238 individuals, 23 per cent cited their county agent, 39 per cent gave the schools or vocational agriculture teachers, 2 per cent mentioned both of these sources, and 36 per cent credited other sources only.

The distribution suggests that the two primary sources reached different individuals; only 2 per cent of the respondents cited both sources as a factor in their recruitment. Table 1, which follows, shows that the schools reached individuals who tended to be younger and better educated than the individuals reached either by the county agents or the "other sources."

TABLE 1

AGE AND EDUCATION OF RESPONDENTS BY RECRUITMENT SOURCE (In Percentages)

	County Agent N=54	Schools N=94	Other Sources N=85
Age			
Under 26 years of age	24	41	26
26-45	63	48	62
Over 45 years of age	13	11	12
Total	100	100	100
Median age	31.6	27.3	31.4
Years of Schooling			
Less than 9 grades	35	27	33
9-11 grades	31	36	34
12 grade or more	33	37	33
Total	99[a]	100	100
Median education	9.9	10.4	10.0

[a] Per cent totals have not been rounded to 100 in the tables in this report.

These data suggest that the selectivity hypothesis best applies to the schools and vocational agriculture teachers. Persons recruited by the county agents as a group do not differ from those recruited through sources other than schools and teachers of vocational agriculture. It should be noted that this conclusion is relative; all of the recruitment sources produced selective results because the project failed to recruit the "hardest core."

On April 3 the staff again mailed an appeal to more than 500 professional rural leaders, including county agents, teachers of vocational agriculture, ministers and high school principals, urging them to recruit the exceptionally deprived through personal contact. On April 13 a follow-up letter was sent to these same rural leaders announcing a second set of visits to eleven areas of the state where applications would be received. At the same time the first 377 recruits who were heads of households were asked by letter to report to the area centers "to fill out the necessary papers for referring you to the local employment office for clearance."

When a recruit visited a center in April he was given the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scales and the Gray Oral Reading Test.[13]

By the end of April, 656[14] persons had been interviewed, screened and tested. Many were found to lack one or another of the characteristics specified in the eligibility statement.

---

[13] These tests were chosen in consultation with Harold Wolff, then of the Jewish Employment and Vocational Service, St. Louis, in preference to the following which were also considered: The Iowa Test of Basic Skills, the General Aptitude Test Battery, the Institute for Personality and Ability Test, The Nonreading Intelligence Test for Use with the Educationally Deficient, and the test under development by Tuskegee personnel. Wolff returned to Tuskegee Institute in April to conduct a workshop on techniques for administering the Wechsler test.

[14] In various reports to OMAT the project has cited 635 and 700 as sizes of the applicant pool. The Project Director informed BSSR that 656 is the number of persons for whom records exist. There may have been others who were contacted for whom no records exist. The lists supplied by the project indicated that 2 of the 182 trainees' names and 4 of the 474 applicants' names submitted were duplicate. In this report we used the smaller numbers.

Selection of Trainees

In order to understand the problems which the staff faced in selecting trainees, we can refer to data which we gathered through interviews with both trainees and applicants after training was completed. We interviewed 127 of the 180 persons who reported for training and 111 of the 470 who applied but were not selected or were accepted but declined to participate.[15]

We asked all of them, among other things, about their race, position in family, education and economic status at the time they made application for training. Assuming for the moment that the 236 persons we interviewed were representative of all recruits, we can ask how many were qualified for acceptance.

Choosing the three criteria that are most clearly specified--simultaneously being head of a household, having no more than an 8th grade education, and reporting a personal income of less than $1,500 for the year preceding application--we can ask whether the project staff could have selected 180 trainees with these three qualities from the total of 656 whose applications they processed.

To extrapolate from the two samples totaling 236 interviewees to the total number of 656 recruits from which the samples were taken, we must account for the fact that we interviewed 70 per cent of the trainees, but only 24 per cent of the applicants (including among the latter those not accepted as well as those accepted who declined training) In effect, we have weighted our two sets of interview data according to the proportion that each is of its total; the number of interviewed trainees having a given set of characteristics has been multiplied by 1.47 and the interviewed applicants by 4.23. Table 2 illustrates these operations.

---

[15] All of the trainees and 200 of the applicants were selected for interview but we interviewed only those who could be located in the project state or at other locations where we had interviewers. We realize that partial coverage may introduce some bias, and we will note this wherever we think it is relevant to interpretation.

TABLE 2

PROJECTION OF ESTIMATED NUMBER OF RECRUITS WHO WOULD HAVE BEEN HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS, WITH NO MORE THAN EIGHTH GRADE EDUCATIONS AND INCOMES OF NO MORE THAN $1,500 DURING PREVIOUS YEAR BASED ON CHARACTERISTICS OF TRAINEES AND APPLICANTS WHO WERE INTERVIEWED

	Number with all Three Characteristics Among Those Interviewed	Weighting Factor	Estimated Number With Three Characteristics
Trainees	52	1.47[a]	76
Applicants	17	4.23[b]	72
Estimated Total Number with Three Characteristics			148

[a] 187 (trainees) divided by 127 (who were interviewed)

[b] 469 (applicants) divided by 111 (who were interviewed)

We arrive at an estimated total of 148 recruits among the 656 who would have had all three of the characteristics just mentioned--head of household, no more than 8th grade education and an annual income of less than $1,500 the year before application. The accuracy of the estimate is, as we said before, entirely dependent upon the extent to which the trainees and applicants we interviewed were representative of all trainees and applicants. But if one considers that there were still other criteria to be used in determining eligibility as it was originally specified, then it is entirely possible that the staff could not adhere to all the specified criteria in selecting trainees.

By the time the staff knew that they could not strictly follow recruitment criteria, they had obtained reading test scores for all recruits and found there was a wide disparity between "functional literacy" and the number of years of education. Many recruits read at a lower level than would have been indicated by the number of years of schooling they had had. By using reading test scores to determine eligibility, the staff could enlarge the number of recruits who could be considered qualified. But even when they had selected only (1) heads of household (along with a few who were not themselves heads but who lived in households where the head was unemployed), and (2) those whose scores on the Gray Oral Reading Test indicated no higher than 8th grade level, the staff had exhausted the "supply" of recruits and was obliged to relax other criteria somewhat or else to reduce the program enrollment. They chose the former option, and notified 180 recruits (who qualified under (1) and (2) above) of acceptance.

But now they encountered another problem. About one-third of those who had been accepted declined to participate.[16] Again the staff had either to substitute from the remaining body of recruits or proceed with less than a full complement. Again they chose the former course, which meant they had to accept as trainees some who read beyond the 8th grade level. To accommodate the needs of the more literate trainees they decided to provide for one basic education class at a more advanced level.

---

[16] The decision not to participate was apparently not due to a lack of interest in training per se. We interviewed 25 of those selected who declined to participate. When recruits were asked "At the time you applied to the project, did you want to be trained as a [successively, each of the four training occupations]," only 12 applicants and four trainees said they wanted to be trained in none of the four. When asked why they did not participate, nine said they had found what they thought was a good job; seven said their general situation had changed; two thought they could do just as well without the training; two said they were not assigned to their chosen field of occupational training; one was away at the time training began; two said they had transportation problems; two said the training allowance offered was insufficient.

Using these modified criteria of eligibility the staff succeeded in filling the training complement. When training began on June 1, 180 trainees were enrolled.[17]

All but 8 of the trainees we interviewed were heads of households.[18] Seventy-seven (60%)[19] of the trainees we interviewed had gone beyond the 8th grade in school, but, according to a project report, only 16 per cent of all trainees scored higher than 8th grade level on reading ability (see Table 3).

TABLE 3

PROJECT REPORT[a] OF TRAINEE DISTRIBUTION BY SCHOOLING COMPLETED AND GRAY ORAL READING TEST SCORES (In Percentages)

	Grades Completed N=180	Scores on Gray Oral Reading Test N=180
9th grade or more	52	16
5th-8th grade	41	22
4th grade or less	7	62
Total	100	100

[a] Source: Tuskegee Institute, Demonstrational Features of The Tuskegee Institute Retraining Program, Volume 1, p. 12.

---

[17] The contract had called for training of at least 160 recruits; anticipating a 10 per cent dropout, the staff reported to OMAT it initially accepted 187. The project provided BSSR with only 180 names.

[18] If we extrapolate from the 127 interviewed to the 180 enrolled we estimate there were 13 altogether who were not heads of household.

[19] It should be noted here that whereas 60 per cent of the interviewed trainees had gone beyond the 8th grade, the staff, reporting on the 180 still in training in July, 1964, found that 52 per cent had better than an 8th grade education (see Table 4) an indication that our interview data slightly over-represent trainees with higher education.

Even though the project report does not show a cross-tabulation of the two distributions of Table 4, it is apparent that years of schooling and scores on the standardized reading tests were not interchangeable measures of the literacy of the trainees. An 8th grade education was not the equivalent of being able to read at the 8th grade level. In the conclusion to this chapter we will speculate about the implications of this finding.

TABLE 4

INTERVIEWED TRAINEES AND APPLICANTS COMPARED
BY YEARS OF SCHOOLING
(In Percentages)

	Trainees N=127	Applicants N=111
Less than 8th grade education	28	14
8th grade	12	7
9th to 11th grade	37	32
12th grade	18	44
More than high school	5	3
Total	100	100

Trainees and Applicants Compared

The project staff did not report on the reading test scores of the applicants, but our interview data permit a number of other comparisons between trainees and applicants. With respect to the criteria of eligibility, we will show that, among those we interviewed, the trainees had had less schooling than the applicants, and were also rated slightly lower by our interviewers in "ability to understand the interview questions and to answer them." Partly associated with their higher level of education, the applicants were also a younger group. With respect to economic criteria, however, the trainees did not appear to be consistently more deprived than the applicants.

Years of schooling.--Although the project staff switched to reading test scores instead of years of education to determine eligibility, the applicants were over qualified by their levels of education as well as by their reading scores. Twice as high a proportion of the applicants had completed high school. Nevertheless, the data reveal that some of the applicants had less than 8th grade educations and they were not the applicants who had been accepted but declined to participate. An explanation of why they were not accepted might be that their reading test scores were higher than grade level. Their rejection might also be accounted for by a policy the staff said they had of choosing persons "who showed initiative and a desire to get ahead." Presumably "initiative" was rated when recruits were interviewed, although we do not know just how this was done.

Literacy Ratings.--Our interviewers were asked to rate each respondent on his ability to understand the interview questions and to respond to them. Since the interviews were conducted after trainees had had the opportunity to improve their communications skills through training, we cannot know from the ratings how trainees and applicants differed at the time of application, but it may be of interest to note that, despite the trainee advantage of twelve months' instruction in basic education, the applicants were rated a little higher over-all (see Table 5).

These data, too, would indicate that the trainees were the more disadvantaged group of the two, even at the conclusion of the training period.

TABLE 5

INTERVIEWERS' RATINGS OF TRAINEES' AND APPLICANTS' FLUENCY IN ENGLISH
(In Percentages)

	Trainees N=127	Applicants N=111
Fluent	64	79
Slight difficulty	26	16
Considerable difficulty	10	5
Total	100	100

Age and residence.--All of the recruits were residents of Alabama and came from all over the state. Most of them did not live on farms.

Age restrictions for determination of eligibility presented no problems for the staff. But because younger Americans are more likely to have gone further in school, and the project was recruiting those of lower literacy level,[20] the staff necessarily chose relatively few persons under the age of 25 and relatively more over the age of 40. Almost half of those who did not enter training were 25 or younger. As we will report in greater detail later, the staff subsequently concluded that the older trainees were more conscientious and benefited more from the training, and so they did not regret the underrepresentation of the younger recruits.

---

[20] Although we pointed out that years of schooling and scores on the reading test were not highly correlated, we might assume some relationship exists between the two. Because the project staff did not cross-tabulate the data on these two measures, we cannot know what association there was--only that for the trainees it could not have been especially high (see Table 4).

TABLE 6

INTERVIEWED TRAINEES AND APPLICANTS COMPARED, BY AGE
(In Percentages)

Age	Trainees N=127	Applicants N=111
25 or under	18	47
26 through 40	56	38
Over 40	26	14
Total	100	100

Income and employment status.--Trainees and applicants who were interviewed did not differ in the total amount of personal earnings they reported for the year before they made application to the project. Forty-one per cent of each group had incomes under $1,000 from their own earnings; 35 and 36 per cent respectively had incomes of from $1,000 to $1,999, and 24 and 22 per cent reported higher incomes. Sixty-two per cent of the trainees and 57 per cent of the applicants had incomes under $1,500, according to their own reports.

Speaking again only of those we interviewed, despite the better education of the applicants, they were unemployed in greater proportion as compared to the trainees (see Table 7), and those who were working were, as a group, more likely to be working fewer than 32 hours a week. But the applicants who were working were a little more likely than the trainees to say that their jobs were steady and neither temporary nor seasonal. The two groups were similar in the proportions who said they had been unemployed at some time during the year before they applied for training.

TABLE 7

INTERVIEWED TRAINEES AND APPLICANTS COMPARED BY EMPLOYMENT SITUATION DURING YEAR BEFORE APPLICATION

(In Percentages)

	Trainees	Applicants
All Respondents	N=127	N=111
Not working at the time of application	28	38
Out of job any time during year before application	60	63
Respondents Working at Time of Application	N=92	N=54
Working less than 32 hours a week	17	26
Rated job held as "steady"	61	76

One cannot equate one of the above indicators with another, but if we were obliged to rate one group as being economically better off than the others on the basis of all the indicators in the above table, then it would seem that the trainees would come out a little ahead. The data support the staff's admission that they were able to select trainees from among the recruits on the basis of only two major criteria: being heads of households and having low scores on reading tests. Nevertheless, about two-thirds had incomes under $1,500 and half had been unemployed sometime during the year preceding application.

If we were to assume that having an education was an economic advantage, then we would have expected to see the applicants show up better than the trainees in Table 7. Because they apparently were not financially better off, we might suggest that it may be because the staff chose those they thought were more eager to get ahead and who had worked harder to do so. But we could also raise the question of whether or not having had more education was, in fact, an economic advantage for this group of people.

Economic Situation of Trainees at Different Educational Levels

If we look only at trainees and compare those who had different numbers of years of formal education, we see at once--by comparing the first column of figures to the other two in Table 8--that the trainees who had no more than an 8th grade education were unemployed in greater proportion at the time they applied for training, they were farm workers in greater proportion, they were more likely to have been earning a low hourly wage, to have held three or more jobs during the year preceding application, and to be the sole wage earners in their households. When it came to total earnings for the year, however, of those who had any earnings, those who went no further than 8th grade were no worse off than the high school graduates; it is the high school dropouts who fared slightly better than others on total annual earnings. On the whole, having finished high school produced no discernible economic advantage.[21]

---

[21] According to Department of Labor Manpower analyses, young Negro high school graduates experience unemployment and placement in unskilled jobs much more frequently than white high school graduates; in fact, they tend to be worse off than white high school dropouts (Manpower Report of the President, March 1965, p. 28). Because of the lack of job opportunities, and the persistence of high levels of racial discrimination, the low value of high school completion is no doubt especially marked in the rural south.

TABLE 8

ECONOMIC SITUATION OF INTERVIEWED TRAINEES BY NUMBER OF YEARS OF SCHOOLING (In Percentages)

	Years of Schooling Completed		
	8th Grade or Less	9th to 11th Grade	12th or More
All Respondents	N=50	N=47	N=30
Unemployed at time of application	38%	17%	27%
Some income from farming during year before application	32%	19%	13%
Trainee only person in household who works	72%	62%	60%
Respondents Employed at Time of Application	N=31	N=37	N=21
Receiving less than $1.05 per hour	65%	43%	43%
Respondents Employed at Some Time During Year Before Application	N=43	N=46[a]	N=28
Held 3 or more jobs	26%	15%	7%
Earnings for year:			
$999 or less	44%	24%	47%
$1,000 to $1,999	35	41	39
$2,000 to $2,999	16	22	14
$3,000 and over	5	13	0
Total	100%	100%	100%

[a] One respondent did not know his annual income.

Specifying this relationship further we find that those trainees we interviewed who were working on farms at the time they applied for training reported lower total annual incomes than did nonfarm workers, but for both, being less than a high school graduate was associated with having made more money during the year before application. (See Table 9).

TABLE 9

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND ANNUAL INCOME FOR FARM AND NONFARM WORKERS AND FOR THE UNEMPLOYED OF TRAINEES INTERVIEWED (In Percentages)

	Farm Employment		Nonfarm Employment		Unemployed	
	11th Grade or Less N=9	12th Grade or More N=3	11th Grade or Less N=61	12th Grade or More N=19	11th Grade or Less N=27	12th Grade or More N=8
Annual Income						
Up to $1499	89	100	51	72	55	57
$1500 and over	11	0	48	28	40	43
Don't Know	0	0	1	0	5	0
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Of course the number of farm workers is quite small (and annual income information reported by unskilled workers is known to be unreliable) but the fact that the relationship is in the same direction for both types of workers lends significance to this finding. Among those who were unemployed when they applied to the project, the relationship does not hold up, but it is not reversed. In other words, there is every indication among the trainees we interviewed that irrespective of type of employment, having had more education had not paid off in terms of annual income. Of course the very process of determination of eligibility introduces a bias that one must recognize in interpreting these data. Quite possibly the majority of southern Negro males who are high school graduates are better off financially than the less educated. Because the majority of the more successful do not apply to the project, the applicants include only the minority who, despite having graduated from high school, have not succeeded financially. To know whether or not education is unrelated or negatively related to economic success for all poor southern Negro males, one would need to have a representative sample of all southern Negro males at each educational level. It would, of course, also be interesting to know how reading test scores--rather than formal educational attainment--were related to economic success.

In any case, it is quite clear that a decision to select, from among rural southern Negroes who apply, those with the least education does not automatically lead to the selection of those who have the lowest annual incomes.

The data also suggest another possible interpretation. Among those who had more education there was a higher proportion who said that another member of the household was the chief provider (see Table 10). These last data[22] suggest that not being able to depend upon another in the household as a source of support presses an individual to raise his total earnings by working longer hours or by having more than one job at a time. There are age differences correlated with the differences in education but they should not account for this finding because both high school graduates and nonhigh school graduates have median ages of 30 or more, which is well beyond the customary age of dependency upon parental support.

---

[22] As might be expected, there is also the tendency for those with less than a high school degree to be more frequently the main source of support in their households. The magnitude of that tendency, however, is less pronounced than the magnitude of the relationship illustrated in Table 10, which emphasizes dependency status.

TABLE 10

JOBS HELD BY OTHERS IN HOUSEHOLD BY EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT OF INTERVIEWED TRAINEES
(In Percentages)

Jobs Held by Others in Household	Educational Achievement	
	11th Grade or Less N=97	12th Grade or More N=30
None	65	57
Yes, but not main source of support	26	13
Yes, and main source of support	9	30
Total	100	100

Six trainees said they had received some assistance from welfare the year before applying for training, but for only one was welfare the major source of support. Seventy-one per cent of the trainees said income from their own job was the major source of family support; an additional 26 per cent had job earnings but did not regard them as the major source of household income.

Three out of 4 of the trainees had lived 13 years or longer in Alabama.

A third (35%) said that they had at some time been in military service.

Summary and Conclusions

Although the trainees in this project were a deprived group of Negro men, the staff members acknowledged that they did not get to the people they most wanted to reach. Recruitment of the most deprived for retraining projects is a difficult task. The most needy either do not hear or do not come forward in response to conventional recruitment messages. The second Associate Director offered a prescription for recruitment at the end of the project year. He said he thought the hardcore could be reached only by going to the local county agents to inquire about the locations of the beer joints and the bootleggers. Then the recruiter should go to those places to get acquainted with the clientele. Over time, and in the course of repeated visits, he might hope to establish the kind of rapport that would lead to interest in a program such as this. Without such intervention he felt that distrust and inertia would preclude participation.

From among all persons who made application for training, the staff chose household heads, or members of households in which the head was unemployed, who also had low reading scores, and who showed initiative and a desire to get ahead. Our data from interviews with trainees and applicants indicate that those selected for training were less well educated but not worse off with respect to employment, than the other applicants.

In view of the project's finding that years of schooling was not a good indicator of literacy, one must question whether education is a useful criterion for selection, assuming that literacy is related to economic well-being.

In view of the absence of correlation between educational level and economic situation, one might also question whether eligibility should be established in terms of both criteria rather than on an either-or basis.

III. THE TRAINING PROGRAM

The project staff reported in detail on the content of the training program, both in progress reports and especially in the final report.[23] In this chapter we have abstracted from these reports, incorporating information which we got in the course of site visits to the project. We first outline the over-all content and then elaborate on specific aspects of the training.

Every trainee was enrolled in basic education classes. Each attended two 90-minute classes, one in English and one in mathematics, Monday through Friday, for the entire project year. Method of instruction and specific curriculum content were varied somewhat to accommodate the different levels of knowledge and ability among the trainees.

At the time the recruits made application for training, they had indicated the kind of job training they wanted. During the first week at the project all trainees were assigned to classes in their chosen occupations, but they then rotated through the others during the ensuing three weeks. After exposure to all four types of skill training, trainees were given a second opportunity to choose their training fields. Only three opted to change from the original assignment.

So as to integrate job training with basic education and also to take into account their varied abilities, trainees were assigned to classes according to choice of job training and then according to literacy level as measured by the reading tests given earlier. Those who progressed rapidly in basic education were allowed to transfer into a more advanced group. Sixteen trainees moved from the project English classes into a college class, and others were gradually transferred from Group B (those whose test scores were lower) to Group A project classes.

---

[23] Tuskegee Institute, op. cit.

Occasionally a basic education or a job training class took a field trip: to a library, historical monument or establishment where trainees could watch on-the-job performance in the job-training fields.

Group counseling sessions were scheduled for one hour each week. In addition, an individual counseling service was provided.

Medical examinations and care were made available by the Institute Hopsital; the contract did not allow for payment for such services.[24] Three trainees were offered special diets at the John A. Andrew Hospital at no cost to themselves. Eye glasses were provided by the State Vocational Rehabilitation Service. Dental care was provided at the trainee's own expense. Counseling and, if necessary, sanctions were used to encourage or require the trainees to avail themselves of medical care.

The project staff promoted extra-curricular activities which the trainees initiated and encouraged them to take part in campus life.

In the pages to follow, each of the major activities is described in somewhat greater detail.

The Basic Education Program

Communications.--Two teachers and a coordinator made up the communications instructional staff. All three appear to have been exceptionally able and eager to enrich the lives of the trainees.

---

[24] Tuskegee wished to be reimbursed for the hospital services. OMAT felt that Tuskegee's charges for subsistence--board and room--were sufficient to absorb the medical costs. The Tuskegee experience has shown the great need of rural adults for medical examinations and treatment.

Trainees who at entrance read at the 4th grade level or above made up an A Group, whereas those who read less well were assigned to a B Group. According to one communications teacher:

> The communication skills were introduced and demonstrated--reading, as a thought getting process through the written page; writing, as putting thoughts on paper; speaking, as expressing ideas and thoughts orally so that others could understand them; and listening, as tuning in, getting or following thoughts and being able to react to them or recall information.

At the beginning, all classes were taught according to the Henney Family Phonics System. Group A, the more advanced group, initially thought the system too elementary, but when tested realized, according to one teacher, how "phonetically deaf they were." After a time the Henney charts were supplemented with additional reading material, centered around areas of job training. Field trips stimulated interest in discussion and in writing reports.

When the students in the advanced group had acquired a thousand word vocabulary they moved into the SRA Reading Program; participants were allowed to progress to material appropriate to their abilities. After a time, in response to lack of initiative on the part of the trainees, the teacher selected a story for each day. New vocabulary was developed and the class then studied the story together, making use of a projector. Exercises at the end of the story were also worked out in the classroom.

A workbook, "I Want To Learn English," by Smith and King, was used to develop capacity to distinguish between verbs, to identify synonyms, homonyms and antonyms, and to give practice in letter and paragraph writing. Tape recordings of trainees' speech were made and speech patterns were criticized by the teacher; class members also noted each other's deficiencies.

The slow learners made less progress; their instructor felt that the carry-over of poor speech habits to reading habits was more pronounced than with the faster group. Even so, after 6 months of training, of the 11 trainees who had not known the alphabet, all knew the letters and could write and spell. Of the 5 who could not write at all, each had mastered manuscript writing. Some moved from 1st to 4th grade level. The slow learners were acquiring about 60 words a week. After retesting with the Gray Oral Reading Test, those who had reached 4th grade level were transferred to the advanced group.

When this group reached the point in Henney where different spellings had the same sound they showed signs of confusion and so the Henney system was temporarily discontinued. Daily experience charts were developed to allow for word development. When the vocabulary of the group was about 800 words, they were transferred to the primary level of SRA. Each day a story was chosen that would give them a new family of words beyond the Henney chart at which they had stopped. This group also eventually moved to the "I Want To Read" workbook. Later on the instructor returned to the Henney system.

Mathematics.--Training in mathematics was acknowledged to be inferior to that in communication; this was attributed by staff members to the inexperience of the mathematics teachers. The math teachers were male graduate students who had been chosen to fill the dual roles of teacher and communications link. They were billeted in the two dormitories where resident trainees were housed and were expected to get acquainted with trainees, give them information and to report feedback to other staff members. In fact, they had had little prior experience with the adult poor and the trainees responded slowly in their classes. When this became apparent early in the program, other teachers and staff members held training sessions with the mathematics teachers to help them develop techniques and an appropriate style of presentation.

During the first 8 months, trainees received instruction in topics usually covered in elementary education up to about the 6th or 7th grade level.[25] Having laid this groundwork, the teachers shifted during the last 4 months to problems that trainees would need to solve when they were employed in their respective skills. The staff noted a higher rate of growth and increased interest when work-related problems were introduced.

It is not clear from our data whether the A and B groups received different mathematics instruction or proceeded at a different pace, but presumably they did.

Job Training

Brickmasonry.[26]--The teacher was a practicing brickmason who was regarded by the staff as highly skilled and well qualified to teach. One year's training in this field was believed to qualify a trainee to enter the job market as an apprentice. The course began with a history of the trade, identification of tools and demonstration in the use of the trowel. Trainees then moved to construction sites around the campus. They laid quarry tile floors, lined walls with structural glass tile and constructed concrete block walls. Brick coverings for air-conditioning units were constructed on top of the dormitories. Cement walks were poured. A brick veneer was put on a shop building and on the bookstore. Fireplaces and chimneys were built in the shop. Some trainees built barbeque pits and retaining walls in the community.

---

[25] For detailed outline of content see the projects' final report, op. cit. Volume 1, pp 36-53.

[26] For more detailed course outline see ibid., pp. 57-61.

Both A and B groups were handicapped at the beginning by the lack of enough tools and of sufficient basic education to read and solve mathematical problems. By the end of the training period, however, members of the A group were able to estimate and do layouts from a set of blueprints; members of B group were still somewhat weak in this respect.

Many trainees learned enough in their year, according to the project staff, to function as journeymen. Their instructor, who accompanied them on job interviews, told several trainees that all they needed for employment was a union card, a suggestion taken by some.

Carpentry.[27]--The instructor had been formally trained and had many years of experience as a contractor. The staff regarded him as exceptionally well qualified. The first month of training was devoted to a survey of the history of the trade and the development of expectations about employment in the field. The trainees then began to learn the trade. During the course they erected concrete forms, laid out buildings, erected wood building framing, installed exterior and interior finishes, did trim mill work and affixed hardware, laid many kinds of floors and stairs, and did insulating and roofing. Trainees were also instructed in the erection of prefabricated wood components of an entire wood structure. They added two rooms, a hall and bath and did general repairs to a farm house. They framed walls, hung sheetrock and set and hung doors and windows. They also constructed a three-room building which had been designed so that many types of corners, hips, valleys, common and gripple rafters could be shown. Use and care of tools was emphasized. Trainees often visited construction sites in the community and occasionally assisted workers at these sites.[28]

---

[27] For more detailed course outline see ibid., pp. 63-67.

[28] Trainees were motivated to initiate the making of bulletin boards and display panels and to do some cabinet work on the campus.

Farm machinery.[29]--When this program of instruction began neither books nor equipment had arrived. In the meantime, the classes toured the campus to find machinery that needed repair that could also be used to demonstrate the functioning of the internal combustion engine and the four stroke cycle principle. Besides working on the engines, the trainees repaired brakes and mufflers, generator starters and fuel pumps. The classes learned about cooling systems and engine lubrication. When the additional equipment arrived the group was then able to service and operate the 100 mower, hay conditioner, hay rake and hay baler. They serviced and operated the 316 cotton picker, the 203 IHC combine and a number of gas tractors. As part of their training with the different types of equipment the participants baled about 30 acres of hay, picked 40 acres of cotton and gathered 30 acres of lespedeza hay seed. They overhauled automobile and tractor engines and winterized farm equipment. As parts arrived for the defective equipment that had been rounded up on campus, parts were replaced and engines were repaired and reassembled. Gas and arc welding were taught. From March until June the trainees plowed 80 acres of land and continued to work on the various engines.

As compared to the other 3 fields, this course was regarded by the staff as inferior. Because of difficulty in locating a well qualified instructor, the staff fell back on an Institute professor who was near retirement and not up-to-date on recent developments in this field.

---

[29] For more detailed outline of course content see Ibid., pp. 75-78.

Meat processing.[30]-- An Institute professor with an advanced degree in this field taught the meat processing courses. Trainees were first given an overview of the trade and were instructed in the qualities requisite to success in the field. Physical hygiene was stressed. Following instruction in the use and care of tools and equipment, trainees were taught to use manual and electrical tools. Slaughtering and processing and the interrelation between the two were covered, followed by instruction in cooling, aging, cutting, and curing and pickling. Meat processing was emphasized because the processor is more highly paid and has more security than the slaughterhouse worker.

Finally, the men were taught to wrap and package cuts. Trainees were instructed in display and pricing of meats. At this point the classes took field trips to observe the practices of local markets. All aspects of the training were related to storeroom management. The role relationships existing between employer and employee and between employee and customer were analyzed.

Evaluation of Trainee Performance

All of the teachers rated trainees on their performance, and standardized tests were given at intervals. A Tuskegee graduate student developed substantive tests to measure knowledge in each of the four trade areas. Trainees were also rated by all teachers on application, participation and response to assignments, performance and quality of work, industry, initiative, responsibility, honesty, punctuality, respect for authority, concern for others, physical fitness and personal appearance.

---

[30] For more detailed outline of the course content see ibid., pp.81-84.

The final report submitted by the staff includes an extensive statistical analysis of ratings and test scores.[31] Over-all, those who were residents on the campus, over 35, married and members of Group A received higher ratings and scores.

The Tuskegee testing staff also developed a form for employers to use in evaluating trainees after they had been on the job for a few months.

All of the ratings and testing instruments are included in the appendix to the project's final report.

Counseling

The description of the program given here refers to the latter half of the project. We do not know the extent to which all or some of these features were present during the first half.

One hour of group counseling was conducted each week by the part-time Director of Counseling. Each group included members of both Group A and Group B so that the less verbal members would be stimulated by the others. Initially, the sessions focused on fairly obvious needs of the group: personal hygiene, money management, citizenship, the roles of the man in the American society, the roles of other family members and the like. Later on, the emphasis shifted to such topics as preparation for employment interviews and job performance.

Trainees were told that they were welcome to visit the Counselor to discuss personal problems. When it became apparent that the majority of the trainees were timid about taking advantage of this offer, those who had not elected to come in on their own received notes telling them of a scheduled appointment.

---

[31] Ibid, Volume II. See also discussion of shortcomings in statistical analysis on pp.58-59.

Trainees punched a time clock and if a trainee had excessive absences or tardiness he was called to the office of the Assistant Director for a conference. The Shop Supervisor, who supervised all four occupational training groups, was acquainted with all the men; he was asked to identify the problems of each individual trainee and to report these to the counseling office. Problems he observed that were common to many men became topics for group counseling; individual problems were brought up in individual sessions.

In some respects all of the project staff performed counseling functions. For example, when a trainee appeared at his English class with a bad cut, bandaged in a dirty handkerchief, he was told about the danger of infection and urged to visit the hospital. When on the day following he appeared in the same fashion, he was told that if he did not visit the doctor he would be barred from class. The Associate Director made a practice of dropping into the dormitories late Friday evenings to visit the trainees and to observe their pay-day habits. In particular he noted any indications of excessive use of alcohol. He frequently called on Sunday evenings, too, when the trainees who had gone home for the weekend had returned to the campus.

The two graduate student mathematics teachers who lived in the dormitories with the trainees were available most of the time to give information or help.

When the full-time counselors joined the project, they felt they needed additional techniques for identifying the problems which the trainees had. The previously administered Mooney Problem Check List was found very useful for this purpose. Fifty-eight per cent of the trainees checked ten or more problems. Apparently the men were not unwilling to admit to their problems, but had difficulty in responding to a verbal request to say what problems they had. The check list responses provided a bridge for counselor-trainee discussions, and the staff prized the technique highly. Many of the problems thus identified were sufficiently serious that the staff called upon psychologists and psychiatrists at the Veterans Administration Hospital to give them assistance. Counselors were also surprised at some of the check list identifications. For example, they found that a large number of men who were married and had large families indicated they needed sex education. This became a topic for group counseling--led by the women counselors--as did other problem areas that were shared by many of the trainees.

Financial problems were especially common. The Associate Director said that college patterns of dress were adopted by the trainees. He considered it legitimate that they aspire to improve their appearance, but thought that many trainees spent more than they could afford on clothing. They left owing a total of about $1,000 to local merchants for clothing purchases and services such as dry cleaning. Some trainees spent money that their families needed, and the staff noted that younger trainees were particularly likely to overspend on themselves.

Families of the men presented another type of problem. As one counselor put it, "When the men entered training, their wives' aspirations spiraled like a missile moving off its launch pad." Wives expected that after the year of training their husbands should be able to provide them with much more than was realistic. Many wives came to the Institute to talk with the counselors, but the staff felt that they should have had a family counselor who could visit the families to help them with their problems and to explain to the wives that their husbands could not be expected to do all that the wives were demanding. Resident trainees were likely to return from home on Sunday night depressed and worried because of psychic demands made on them by their families. The project did not have staff to counsel the wives.[32]

Some financial problems were met through the MDTA Trainees' Credit Association that was formed. The staff believed that loans extended to individuals made it possible for them to remain in the program. The Association encouraged each trainee to save at least $1 a week.

Two of the trainees had serious health problems: one had severe epileptic seizures and the other was a schizophrenic. Efforts were made to help them to understand their own problems and to deal with them.

The younger trainees, who were also those with the highest I.Q.'s were especially prone to absenteeism, and they complained of diffuse physical ills. Although these men were regarded as the most flexible of the trainees, they were also thought to require the greatest amount of counseling.

During the project year two of the trainees' wives attempted to commit suicide. Although the counselors were all professionals, they were not trained to deal with serious emotional illness of either trainees or family members and they felt that they should have had a psychiatrist available for consultation and referral.

Staff members agreed that the need for counseling was tremendous. In the relatively short period in which their intensive and extensive counseling approach was conducted, however, it was difficult to conclude which techniques were most effective. It may be that the techniques employed--group counseling, individual counseling, bull sessions in the dormitories, instructors' reinforcement of proper standards, etc.--all combined to provide a milieu in which trainees could almost imperceptibly adopt new sets of behavior.

---

[32] See comment by Associate Director on p. 89.

Cultural Enrichment

One hour a week was set aside for a lecture by a visitor who was prominent in the community or at the Institute. Lecture topics included development of motivation and expectations about the personal growth attendant to participation in the project, health and sanitation, the importance of learning, civil rights, success on the job, the use of money, civic opportunities and responsibilities, and the like.

Each week the trainees saw a one hour educational movie dealing with such topics as natural science, jet propulsion, credit, friendship, good driving habits, conservation, and travel.

Current events discussions were incorporated into the content of the English classes. Trainees were assigned to engage in role playing for the purpose of extending their perceptions about the behavior appropriate to particular roles other than their own. There were field trips to historic places and public establishments. Those who had some creative ability were encouraged to express it. Two trainees began to write poetry, and before training ended one had received a contract from a music publisher to write song lyrics. Another painted a mural backdrop for the graduation ceremonies. Still another sang a solo at graduation. The trainees published a book of their own biographies. At the end of training they built an exhibit to show their accomplishments and demonstrate their job skills. Each job training class elected a commencement speaker.

Trainees were also urged to participate in campus activities, and apparently they were welcomed and made to feel at home.

IV. TRAINEE RESPONSE TO THE TRAINING PROGRAM

Choice of Training Occupation

We mentioned in the last chapter that the trainees were permitted to choose the kind of job training they wanted. Brickmasonry and meat processing were a little more popular than the other two occupations, as indicated in Table 11. Trainees in these two occupations were younger, as a group, but the project report shows little if any relationship between I.Q. scores and choice of training occupation.

TABLE 11

NUMBER OF TRAINEES, AGE AND I.Q. BY CHOICE OF TRAINING OCCUPATION[a]

Training Occupation	No. Enrolled	Average Age	Average I.Q.
Brickmasonry	48	31	80.28
Carpentry	38	37	83.34
Farm machinery maintenance	36	35	81.91
Meat processing	44	31	79.34
Total	166[b]		

[a] Source: Tuskegee Institute, op. cit., Volume II, pp. 13-17.

[b] The project reported only on the 166 trainees who completed training.

The BSSR interview data do not represent all training occupations equally. Presumably because of differential migration following training of trainees in different training occupations we succeeded in locating for interview differing proportions of those who were enrolled in the four fields. Seven of the 127 we interviewed were dropouts; we interviewed 73 per cent of the 166 who completed training: among the graduates of each of the training occupations, we interviewed 75 per cent in brickmasonry, 74 per cent in carpentry, 89 per cent in farm machinery maintenance, and 55 per cent in meat processing. We have no knowledge that those interviewed differed significantly from those who were not located. The comparisons which follow assume that the response rates are adequate for comparing trainees in each of the several training occupations.

When we look at the BSSR interview data we find a number of ways in which choice of job training is related to trainee characteristics (see Table 12).

Among the graduates those who chose brickmasonry tended to have lower educational achievement but more had pretraining incomes considerably higher than those reported by the other trainees. The interviewers rated more of them fluent in language, they were more likely than others to have been the main breadwinners in the household, and, although unemployment was as common among bricklayers as among the trainees as a group, more bricklayers appear to have been able to compensate by holding multiple jobs or by having others in the household employed. If we can judge by their incomes they were better able to earn a living or perhaps having money was more important to them. These men chose the training occupation that would pay them the highest hourly wage, but that would not necessarily guarantee them regular employment.

TABLE 12

CHARACTERISTICS OF INTERVIEWED TRAINEES BY JOB-TRAINING FIELDS

	All Occupations	Brick-masonry	Carpentry	Farm Equipment	Meat Processing
All Respondents	N=126	N=37	N=28	N=36	N=25
Personal Characteristics:					
Over 35 years of age	43%	35%	61%	45%	32%
12 or more years of education.	24%	14%	11%	22%	56%
Rated by interviewer as fluent in English	79%	87%	64%	77%	88%
Married and living with spouse	79%	84%	72%	95%	64%
Had military service	35%	32%	25%	36%	48%
While in training thought would want only training related work at completion.	73%	92%	72%	57%	72%
Median number of persons in household.	5[a]	5[a]	5[a]	4-5[a]	5[a]
Employment Characteristics:					
Unemployed at some time during year preceding application.	59%	62%	71%	50%	52%
Unemployed at time of application. . .	28%	24%	36%	19%	32%
Trainee income from all jobs during year preceding application more than $1,500	36%	54%	29%	28%[b]	33%[b]
Own jobs(s) main source of household income during year preceding application.	69%	78%	64%	75%	60%
Two or more persons in household held jobs for one month or more during year preceding application	35%	38%	43%	31%	28%
Total household income more than $2,500 year preceding application. .	22%	42%	15%	18%	11%
Farming main or partial source of household income.	22%	14%	29%	42%	4%
Unemployed at Some Time During Year Prior to Application:	N=72	N=22	N=20	N=17	N=13
Unemployed--15 weeks or more	45%	50%	60%	47%	23%
Employed at Some Time During Year Prior to Application:	N=116	N=34	N=23	N=35	N=24
Held more than one job	39%	50%	52%	26%	29%
Employed at Time of Application:	N=92	N=28	N=18	N=29	N=17
Hourly pay less than $1.05 per hour. .	49%	46%	33%	62%	47%
Working less than 40 hours a week	22%	21%	33%	16%[b]	24%
Regarded job as "steady"	61%	79%	39%	62%	53%

---

[a] The median is employed for this item, not a proportion.

[b] Excluded from calculation of proportions are responses which were not ascertained for the indicated items.

Trainees in carpentry tended to be concentrated in the over 35 age group, were not high school graduates and rated below average in language fluency. They were characterized by notably high rates of unemployment, few had had jobs they regarded as steady, and their income level was low. As compared to the men in brickmasonry and meat processing they were more likely to have claimed some income from farming. Carpentry trainees could anticipate an hourly rate second only to brickmasons; these two trades have in common the likelihood that work will not always be steady. Although trainees in the two fields had similar pretraining patterns of unemployment, those in carpentry had had lower personal and household incomes.

Farm machinery maintenance trainees came disproportionately from farming employment. They had acquired less than average formal education, but more had completed high school than the trainees in the construction trades. They were more likely than others to be married. They were especially likely to be the sole supporters of their families and to report low pretraining personal and household incomes. They had had fairly steady jobs over-all before training, but at a relatively low hourly rate. Working on a farm appears to have been the major correlate of their choice of training area.

The trainees who chose meat processing had by far the most education and also were rated higher than average in language fluency. They were younger, less likely to be married, and nearly half reported some period of military service. They were a little less likely to have been the main source of household support before they came into training, and although they showed a moderate frequency of unemployment during the year preceding training, they experienced shorter periods of unemployment than trainees in the other skills area.

The above findings would suggest that trainees did not choose training occupations randomly, but that personal and social characteristics and experience in the labor market were related to occupational choice. Brickmasonry trainees, who had enjoyed high earnings in the past, chose the training occupation which would offer them the highest hourly rates. Carpentry, which also pays relatively high hourly wages, attracted older workers who seem to have been economically less secure and relatively deprived. The service and sales occupation of meat processing appealed most to younger men with more education. And those who had been associated with farming were attracted disproportionately to farm machinery maintenance.

Looking at the sixth item in Table 12 we can also see differential commitment to the different kinds of jobs. When interviewed in the Spring of 1966, the men trained in brickmasonry were more inclined than others to say that at the time they were in training they looked forward only to training-related employment. Those in farm machinery maintenance recalled the lowest level of commitment to their field.

Trainee Evaluation of Job Training

When we asked those we interviewed who had completed training whether they felt they had learned enough to perform in the occupation, 77 per cent of the 127 trainees said that they had.[33] Twelve said the training period was too short and one said he was incapable of learning. Five blamed poor teaching and 9 felt that lack of equipment was responsible for the inadequacy of the training. Evaluation of the adequacy of the training was strongly related to training occupation, as indicated in Table 13.

---

[33] Because of the low level of literacy of some of the trainees, the staff felt that 24 of them were just ready to begin job training at the time the project came to an end.

As we will note in the conclusions to this report, the staff thought it would be desirable to vary the training period according to the needs of the individual. Some persons could be trained in 9 months; others should be allowed to remain as long as two years.

TABLE 13

PER CENT OF INTERVIEWED TRAINEES WHO FELT
THEY HAD LEARNED ENOUGH THROUGH TRAINING
TO PERFORM JOBS BY TRAINING OCCUPATION

Training Occupation	Learned Enough to Do Job	
	Number	Per Cent
Brickmasonry	35[a]	95
Carpentry	27[a]	78
Farm machinery maintenance	34[a]	62
Meat processing	24[a]	96

[a] Dropouts were excluded from the numbers on which percentages were computed.

As the trainees had been competing in the job market between the time they completed their training and the time we interviewed them, they had experiences additional to their more immediate training reactions on which to base their evaluations. Those trained in brickmasonry and in meat processing were much more favorably disposed: more than 9 out of 10 thought the training was adequate, whereas only 3 out of 4 in carpentry, and 2 out of 3 in farm machinery maintenance thought they had learned enough to perform in the jobs for which they had presumably been trained.

When these men were asked what it was about the training that was inadequate, they gave the reasons enumerated in Table 14.

TABLE 14

REASONS GIVEN BY INTERVIEWED TRAINEES FOR EVALUATION OF TRAINING AS INADEQUATE

Reason Given[a]	Brick Masonry N=2	Carpentry N=6	Farm Machinery N=13	Meat Processing N=1
Period too short	1	4	6	1
Trainee incapable	-	1	-	-
Poor teaching	1	-	4	-
Lack of equipment	-	1	8	-

[a] Dropouts (6) are excluded from the table.

Trainees in carpentry and farm machinery maintenance were more inclined than others to think that the period of time was too short, but only those in farm machinery objected with any frequency to the quality of the teaching or the equipment. The reader will remember that the staff said that instruction in this field was not up to standard.

Inadequate instruction may produce attitudinal consequences with respect to the value of the training in the labor market. Those in carpentry and farm machinery maintenance were less likely to think that employers consider training as a substitute for experience on the job.

TABLE 15

PER CENT OF INTERVIEWED TRAINEES WHO THOUGHT TRAINING WAS AN ACCEPTABLE SUBSTITUTE FOR EXPERIENCE BY TRAINING OCCUPATION

Training Field	Training is Substitute for Experience	
	Number	Per Cent
Brickmasonry	37	81
Carpentry	28	71
Farm machinery maintenance	36	64
Meat processing	25	92

If we remember that the trainees in carpentry and farm machinery maintenance were the older trainees who also had had less education, we might explain the lesser satisfaction of the men in these two fields by saying that they were less well prepared for training before they came, and that the training proceeded at too rapid a pace for them.

As indicated in Table 16, the older trainee and the trainee with less education were less likely to think they had learned enough to perform on the job. Men with these characteristics were also more likely to have chosen carpentry and farm machinery maintenance. Whether their lower evaluations of the adequacy of training is a reflection of inferior instruction or a reflection of their own relatively greater prior deprivation and lesser ability we cannot know for sure.

TABLE 16

PER CENT OF INTERVIEWED TRAINEES WHO FELT TRAINING WAS ADEQUATE, BY EDUCATION AND AGE

	Learned Enough to do Job	
	Number	Per Cent
Education		
8th grade or less	48[a]	73
9th - 11th grades	45[a]	85
12th grade or more	29[a]	86
Age		
Under 26 years	23[a]	83
26-45 years	80[a]	81
Over 45 years	18[a]	78

[a] Excludes those who dropped out of the program.

Of course, the trainees' own perceptions are not infallible or even consistent. Thus, the trainees who were least likely to think they had learned enough to perform on the job were more inclined than others to say when asked, "As far as you know, how has the training project worked out. . . well, or poorly or what would you say?" that the program worked out well (see Table 17). However, it may well be that this over-all evaluation was not done in relation to the adequacy of training, but in terms of other dimensions. The staff reported that a group of younger trainees with relatively higher I.Q.'s and more education were inclined to excessive absenteeism and claimed numerous minor physical ailments to excuse themselves. BSSR data show a tendency on the part of the younger, better educated men to give a lower over-all evaluation to the training experience.

TABLE 17

PER CENT OF INTERVIEWED TRAINEES WHO FELT THAT THE PROJECT HAD "WORKED OUT WELL," BY EDUCATION AND AGE

	"Worked Out Well"	
	Number	Per Cent
Education		
8th grade or less	50	90
9th-11th grade	47	72
12th grade and over	30	77
Age		
Under 26 years	23	74
26-45 years	85	79
Over 45 years	19	95

The general quality of the training was rated as "good" by about equal proportions of individuals at each age and education level. This suggests again that the differences in the trainees' over-all evaluations are not functions of perceived quality of the skill training.

Trainee Evaluation of Basic Education

The staff believed that basic education both in its relation to skill training and in its intrinsic worth was a necessary part of the preparation for employment; they also thought that it had an additional payoff as a form of cultural enrichment. Our analysis of the trainee interview data suggests that trainees generally agree but that their agreement is conditioned by their previous education. Whereas 92 per cent of those who had gone no further than the 8th grade regarded basic education as essential, only 48 per cent of those with high school educations said they needed it (see Table 18). The fact that the more highly educated did not regard it as necessary to learning the job skills does not, of course, mean that they did not realize some benefit from it. For example, three trainees passed high school equivalency tests at the end of the training period and others expected to be able to do so shortly after that time.

TABLE 18

PERCEPTIONS OF NEED FOR BASIC EDUCATION TO LEARN JOB SKILLS AMONG INTERVIEWED TRAINEES, BY PRIOR EDUCATION (In Percentages)

	Prior Education		
	8th Grade or Less N=49[a]	Some High School N=46[a]	12th Grade or More N=23[a]
Needed basic education in order to learn job skills	92	70	48

[a] Nine trainees who said they did not know whether or not they needed the basic education were not included in the figures.

Trainees were also asked to say in what other ways they had benefited from the basic education. They were considerably more likely to mention first a benefit associated with their English classes rather than one associated with the instruction in mathematics. In Table 19 their answers have been enumerated. Only 6 trainees were able to think of no benefits; all but 47 could think of at least two assets they wanted to name.

TABLE 19

WAYS IN ADDITION TO LEARNING JOB SKILLS IN WHICH BASIC EDUCATION WAS THOUGHT BY INTERVIEWED TRAINEES TO HAVE HELPED THEM

Other Ways In Which Basic Education was Helpful	Per Cent Who Mentioned
Read faster	35
General social competence, poise	36
Speak better	13
A refresher of previous learning	12
Can read the newspaper	5
Write better	5
Improved work habits	3
Managing for family; planning	4
Helping children with homework	2
Doing mathematical problems	21
Miscellaneous other	23
None, Don't know any	5
Total	164[a] (N=127)

[a] Total adds to more than 100 per cent because 80 trainees mentioned more than one way.

As indicated by "salience" or priority of mention, the greater emphasis put on the value of the communications instruction may indicate that increased ability to read and write is generally more useful than increased facility with mathematics, or it may reflect that the trainees, as well as the staff, appreciated the superior quality of instruction in the English classes.

Residence on Campus

As we noted earlier, whether a trainee lived on the campus or commuted to the project was said to be entirely a matter of the distance of his home from the project. Except for those in farm machinery maintenance, the number of residents and commuters in the occupational fields was identical (see Table 20).

TABLE 20

DISTRIBUTION OF RESIDENT AND COMMUTER TRAINEES BY TRAINING OCCUPATION[a]

Training Occupation	Number of Residents	Number of Commuters
Brickmasonry	24	24
Carpentry	19	19
Farm machinery maintenance	21	15
Meat processing	22	22
Total number	86[b]	80[b]

[a] Source: Op. cit, Volume II. However, the numbers vary among the several sets of tables in the report.

[b] Includes only trainees who completed training.

It seems somewhat remarkable that there should be so little variation between the two columns of figures in the previous table, but we have no knowledge of any other element that determined living arrangement. The staff had planned to have half of the trainees in residence and half of them commuting, undoubtedly for the purpose of evaluating the effect of living on the campus, but unfortunately the matching apparently ended at that point. The two groups had somewhat dissimilar educational backgrounds, and those who commuted were decidedly older and had different occupational histories. As we shall see later on, the residents tended to be better off in some respects after training, but they were also better off economically before they entered the program (see Table 21).

TABLE 21

PRETRAINING CHARACTERISTICS BY RESIDENCE ON CAMPUS

Pretraining Characteristics	Residents N=66 Per Cent		Commuters N=61 Per Cent	
12 or more years of education	18	(66)	28	(61)
Over 35 years old	33	(66)	54	(61)
Married and living with spouse	82	(66)	79	(61)
Unemployed when applied for training	23	(66)	33	(61)
At some time unemployed for 27 weeks or more	24	(66)	38	(61)
Unemployed anytime year before application	61	(66)	56	(61)
Personal income year before application under $1500	58	(66)	67	(61)
Receiving less than $1 an hour when applied for training (of those employed)	48	(50)[a]	54	(39)[a]
Jobs "steady" time of application (of those employed)	60	(50)[a]	65	(39)[a]

[a] Percentage based on number of trainees employed at time of application.

We have also mentioned before that the staff found that test scores and teachers' ratings showed higher over-all performance on the part of the campus residents, but we think their superiority may be accounted for by certain advantages which they enjoyed before entering training. As is always the case when two groups differ before exposure to a stimulus, it is difficult to say anything about the effect, if any, that the stimulus had.

The Trainees' "Worries" While in Training

One in ten of the trainees said that while he was in training he had some worry about whether or not he would be able to complete the program. Most of the worries stemmed from personal or family situations, not from requirements which the program content imposed. The things that trainees said caused them to worry are listed in Table 22.

TABLE 22

REASONS GIVEN BY INTERVIEWED TRAINEES
FOR WORRYING ABOUT COMPLETING TRAINING

	Number of Trainees Reporting	Number of Times Mentioned
No worries	113	
Worries	14	
Nature of Worry		
Ill or homesick		3
Problems with the law		2
Illness in family		1
Other family problems		3
Training allowance not sufficient		3
Course load too heavy		1
Insufficient equipment		1
Miscellaneous, other		3
Total		17[a]

[a] Some trainees mentioned more than 1 worry.

Because a large number of trainees came in to ask about the chances of getting training-related jobs, during the training period, the staff assumed that this was a source of worry. Our data indicate that 97 trainees, or three out of four, of those we interviewed claimed not to have worried about it at any time (see Table 23).

TABLE 23

REASONS GIVEN BY INTERVIEWED TRAINEES FOR WORRYING ABOUT GETTING TRAINING-RELATED JOBS

	Number of Times Mentioned
Worries During Early Part Of Training:	
Skill training inadequate	1
Trainee felt inferior to classmates	2
Generalized doubt and anxiety	3
Other	1
Total	7
Worries Midway Through Training:	
Skill training inadequate	2
Trainee felt inferior to classmates	2
Other	1
Total	5
Worries Near End of Training:	
Skill training inadequate	5
Trainee felt inferior to classmates	1
Not enough jobs for all	7
Past experience re demand or quality of jobs	5
Opinion of other trainees re market	3
Generalized doubt or anxiety	3
Other	1
Total	25

As one might expect, those who said they did worry about getting a job were more likely to say the concern arose as the project neared completion. By and large the trainees appear to have entered upon training with the expectation that jobs would be forthcoming; only when they were faced with the prospect of going out into the job market did some of them become apprehensive.

As Table 23 shows, a total of 8 trainees said that they worried because they felt the job training was inadequate. Five worried because they felt inferior to the majority of the trainees. Worries about the job market or worries based on their own personal experience in the market began to bother 15 of the men we talked to as the time drew near for them to enter the market again. Half a dozen claimed some generalized anxiety which they could not associate with any particular aspect of the problem. None of these Negro men specifically mentioned racial discrimination in the job market as a source of worry.

Dropouts

Out of 180 registrants, 166, or 91 per cent, completed training. We interviewed 6 of the 16 dropouts, too few to draw any conclusions about the dynamics involved. Four said they left for reasons of their own, and two were advised or asked to leave. The only meaningful observation to be made on this point is that such a low dropout rate is remarkable.

Summary and Conclusions

Choice of training occupation was associated with the backgrounds of the trainees. Those who chose brickmasonry were more likely to have had higher incomes before entering training; those who chose farm machinery maintenance were most apt to have claimed farming as the main or partial source of income; the carpentry trainees were somewhat more disadvantaged in terms of education and employment history; those who chose meat processing were, as a group, younger, more apt to have been in service and better educated than the others.

When the trainees were interviewed in the Spring of 1966, four out of five said they felt that training had qualified them for jobs in their respective training fields. Those trained in carpentry and farm machinery maintenance were less likely than the other trainees to say that they were equipped to compete in the job market.

The younger, better educated trainees were more likely to think they had sufficient training to do their jobs, but they were also less likely to say that on the whole the project had "worked out well." Possibly those who were initially most deprived felt the greatest appreciation for the opportunity, even though they felt at a competitive disadvantage when it came to getting a job.

Perception of need for basic education was inversely related to prior education of the trainees. But even those who felt they did not need it in order to learn the job skills could nevertheless identify ways in which it had benefited them. Improvement in communication skills was more salient to them than improvement in mathematics.

The number of resident and nonresident trainees was fairly evenly divided by training occupation, but the residents and commuters were not matched groups. The commuters were decidedly older and more of them had been unemployed or earning relatively little before they came into training. The fact that they were not matched groups precludes evaluation of residence as an experimental variable.

Most of the trainees said that while they were in training they did not worry about being able to complete the program. As the program came to an end a few more of them worried about whether or not they would be able to get jobs.

The project had a remarkably low dropout rate.

V. JOB DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT

Under the terms of the OMAT contract the sum of $14,865 was to be paid to the Alabama State Employment Service for which their staff would develop jobs and place the trainees. The Tuskegee project had to assume this function for a number of reasons. (1) The State Employment Service in Alabama does not customarily engage in job development; its staff members merely refer applicants to openings of which employers have informed them. To provide better than the usual services to an all-Negro group might have provoked animosity in the majority group with which the service personnel was thought to identify. (2) Tuskegee Institute certainly had greater prestige and probably had more freedom and willingness to represent poor Negroes than any other agent in Alabama. (3) The project staff wanted to protect the trainees from exploitation, and it would have been awkward to intervene in a negotiation between employer and applicant which had been structured by the Employment Service.

The state did not accept the money or the responsiblity which went with it. We have been unable to document the extent of communication between the project staff and AESC at the state level. It is possible that informal conversations took place, but even this cannot be documented. We do know that the representative of the nearest local ES office first visited the project on June 11, 1965--at the end of training. At that time he was asked for aid in placing the meat processers and farm equipment repairmen. He demurred at revealing job orders, if any, in his files, recommended that the men register with the offices in their home communities, and suggested that the project address its request to Montgomery, the state office. The purpose of his visit to the project was to obtain placement information.[34]

The project began job development in the late spring of 1965. Staff members made a concerted effort in the short time remaining before the completion of training: they compiled lists of employers in the state; they contacted Tuskegee alumni; they asked for and received from the Georgia Employment Service a list of contractors in the area who were performing Federal Government contracts on which trainees might be employed; they also contacted the Columbia, South Carolina ES office;[35] they ran their fingers through the yellow pages of communities throughout the state; they asked trainees to tell them about employers in their home areas who might employ them; they contacted the Urban Leagues in nearby communities; they made arrangements with contractors doing construction work on campus; they contacted other E & D projects reputed to have developed an excess of jobs;[36] and, they arranged with OMAT for a labor mobility demonstration project to relocate trainees. In a short period of time the project staff almost exhausted the alternatives to door-to-door canvassing of employers. The only large scale employment opportunity within the state which was not pursued was the Federal installation at Huntsville which project spokesmen felt would be too controversial.

---

[34] The visit took place in the presence of a BSSR staff member and does not reflect a second hand report.

[35] The Associate Project Director had been a consultant to the Director of the Bureau of Employment Security, U. S. Department of Labor, before joining this project, and in this capacity had visited two dozen local offices in several states and knew them thoroughly.

[36] This suggestion came from BSSR.

The project's job developers were Negroes. OMAT had suggested that whites function as intermediaries between the trainees and prospective employers but Tuskegee's decision not to utilize whites probably had much to recommend it. There was no evidence to show that whites would be more effective in this position than Negroes, nor was there evidence to show that white job developers would have received less abuse from prospective employers or have been more able to tolerate such abuse. It is plausible also that the trainees may have been impressed by the sight of Negroes contacting white employers for jobs in meat processing and farm equipment repair, previously white occupations in many areas.

The general procedure followed in job development began with a letter describing the project and the backgrounds and qualifications of the trainees to each firm on the list compiled by the project. Prospective employers were invited to visit the project to observe trainee performance, and many accepted the project's invitation. Employers of meat processors were especially likely to accept and a number of jobs grew out of these site visits.

A short time after the introductory letter was received the job developers called for an appointment or dropped by to see those employers within about a 100-mile radius of Tuskegee. Those located at a greater distance were contacted by long distance telephone. If an employer indicated that he had even a single vacancy, three trainees were sent for the employment interview, accompanied by a member of the job development staff or an instructor. In every case the employer was given a choice from among several trainees. The staff member who went along was able to find out what qualities the employer considered most important as well as protect the trainees' rights to equal employment opportunity. The trainee took with him a transcript showing his record in basic education and in job training and the number of absences he had had during the training year.

The project used administrative funds to pay the travel expenses for job interviews. Projects serving rural populations and placing them on jobs in locations removed from the training site--Tuskegee in this instance--must have some means by which to arrange job interviews. Most employers would not come to the training site. Tuskegee's alternative was to send the trainees to the employers. BSSR considers job placement for the trainees to be an integral part of their training experience. Funds to cover travel expenses for trainees--and in Alabama, at least for a staff member accompanying them--seem to be necessary to place large numbers of trainees. Trainees cannot be expected to travel by themselves to areas, and employers, unknown to them and at their own expense. Tuskegee's recognition of this need and willingness to meet it are both commendable.

A unique feature of the job development program was the establishment of guidelines for minimum hourly rates for three of the training occupations. The project staff felt that a brickmason should get no less than $2.75 per hour, a carpenter, $2.25, and a meat processor, $1.50. They also insisted upon higher rates of pay for the trainees who had excelled. The fact that at least some of the men were highly skilled after training lent validity to the project's wage demands. We would speculate that the project's guidelines also functioned to give the trainees an appreciation of their market value.[37]

---

[37] In the follow-up interviews trainees were asked what their wage expectations were. The median expected wage was about $1.55 an hour; among training occupations the medians ranged from over $1.95 an hour for bricklayers to $1.50 an hour for meat processors.

The staff members found the task of job development time-consuming and delicate. It was difficult to educate employers to accept Negroes in positions customarily reserved for whites. They found the problem particularly acute in dealing with small firms or local branches of larger ones. For example, their preliminary experience on the first round of local calls led them to make it a practice to contact the personnel director at the regional offices of the chain stores, because he would be more likely to place a trainee in a branch store than would the local branch manager. The staff reported that no employer refused to see them and employers claimed no prejudices themselves, but many made the excuse that other employees would be resentful if Negroes were given equal jobs with whites. A few employers were rude and extremely insulting to the staff members when they called, but some of these same employers eventually hired trainees. In the 2 or 3 months during which job development took place,not enough jobs developed in Alabama although the staff went further and further from Tuskegee in their search for openings.

Job development staff members reported to BSSR that employers were particularly interested in the applicant's credit rating as an indicator of his stability and reliability; they were interested in his rate of absenteeism, and considered it an indicator of future dependability on the job; they were interested in the physical fitness of the applicant; they wanted to be sure he would have transportation to and from work; some wanted to know whether or not the Negro was an activist in the civil rights movement and preferred the more conservative candidate. They asked whether the trainee had exhibited any drinking problems. Those who were interviewing meat processors were especially interested in computational skill and they also put greater emphasis on credit rating because many employees would be handling sales.

The staff members felt that 24 of the graduates of the program were not fully qualified by one year of training. They said the 24 had progressed, but were not ready to hold jobs in the given trades. If they had placed only the remaining 142 the staff would have considered themselves successful.

In their efforts to establish a satisfactory reputation with employers and to increase the likelihood that they would be called on repeatedly by individual employers for additional employees, the placement staff had decided it would be wise to place the most skilled trainees first. This policy did work out well for the project in several instances. An employer who had accepted one employee on a trial basis would find him able and call back to the project staff to fill additional vacancies. While giving placement priority to the more skilled may have aided the project in the long run by increasing the number of training related vacancies, it also created a dilemma for the hard pressed placement staff. The less skilled trainees may also have been less able to job hunt effectively on their own, and had to wait their turn for placement services. Many of the latter trainees were without jobs when the project ended and, more than likely, suffered financial hardship or took nontraining related employment.

The project's job development and placement scope was greatly expanded by an amalgamation with a separately funded OMPER labor mobility demonstration project.

The design of the latter called for relocating 50 of the E & D project trainees and 50 other persons. The final report to OMPER of the labor mobility project provided the names of the 103 men who were relocated. Fifty-four of the names corresponded to the names of E & D project trainees; we completed follow-up interviews with 38 of them, roughly a year after their placement. Approximately equal proportions of E & D training project trainees were interviewed who were participants and nonparticipants in the labor mobility demonstration, as shown in Table 24.

TABLE 24

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED IN BSSR FOLLOW-UP BY PARTICIPATION IN LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION
(In Percentages)

	Participants N=54	Nonparticipants N=126
Interviewed	70	71
Not interviewed	30	29
Last reported in		
Alabama	9	4
Other states	11	21
Not ascertained	11	4
Total	100	100

In its report on the project, Tuskegee provided limited, short-run information about the relocatees.[38] Collation of the BSSR follow-up data with the Report permit a more complete analysis of the dynamics and outcomes of the labor mobility demonstration. First, relocated E & D trainees have continued to return to Alabama (see Table 25).

---

[38] Tuskegee Institute: Final Report of the Labor Mobility Demonstration Project No. 87-01-03. Submitted to OMPER, U. S. Department of Labor, August 12, 1966. Analysis in this report is limited to listings of placements, by location only, of persons, their whereabouts two months later, and their incomes, at an unspecified time before relocation and at relocation. The report states that 48 relocatees were from the MDTA program, although our count shows 54. Our calculations based on their data of before and after relocation incomes of trainees and nontrainees suggest that the non-E & D relocatees differed, probably substantially, albeit it in unknown ways, from the E & D trainees:

	E & D Trainees N=54	Nontrainees N=49
"Before" relocation monthly income, mean	$171.74	$219.33
After relocation monthly income, mean	$342.89	$356.10

TABLE 25

STATE OF RESIDENCE OF RELOCATED E & D TRAINEES AT THREE TIME PERIODS (In Percentages)

	Tuskegee Report						BSSR Data		
	At Placement[a] (Summer 1965?)			First Follow-Up (Fall 1965?)			Second Follow-Up (Spring 1966)		
	Interviewed[b] N=38	Not Interviewed[b] N=16	Total N=54	Interviewed[b] N=38	Not Interviewed[b] N=16	Total N=54	Interviewed[b] N=38	Not Interviewed[b] N=16	Total N=54
Alabama	26	25	27	55	25	46	71	31	59
Georgia	16	19	16	13	6	11	13	6	11
Other States	58	56	57	32	69	43	16	31	20
State not ascertained	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31	9
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

[a] One E & D trainee listed as relocated reported to BSSR that he had been unemployed continuously since he left training. Three E & D trainees are listed as relocated in South Carolina. It is not certain that they remained there for more than two days; their employer did not employ Negroes and fired them when he discovered their presence. BSSR understands that they may have been hired by a competitor in the same area the day they were fired.

No specific times of data collection were given in the Report; it is assumed from the context of the Report that it took place during the periods noted.

[b] "Interviewed" and "Not Interviewed" refer to the BSSR follow-up. This particular classification has been introduced to establish that the trend back to Alabama is not a result of the 16 trainees not interviewed. The location of noninterviewed respondents was derived from local informants or post office verification.

At the time of the BSSR follow-up, the relocated E & D trainees were found to be out-of-state slightly more frequently than the nonrelocated (see Table 26). However, the comparison is muddied by trainees from both groups whose whereabouts could not be ascertained. In other words, about one year after relocation, out-of-state residence was only slightly more common among relocated trainees than among those trainees who had not participated in the labor mobility demonstration project.

TABLE 26

STATE OF RESIDENCE OF E & D TRAINEES AT BSSR FOLLOW-UP BY PARTICIPATION IN LABOR MOBILITY PROJECT
(In Percentages)

State of Residence	Participants N=54	Nonparticipants N=126
Alabama	59	72
Other states	31	23
State not ascertained	9	5
Total	100	100

Second, relocated trainees were not selected proportionately from among the four training occupations. Only 5 per cent of the carpenters were relocatees as compared with about 40 per cent of those trained in each of the other three occupations.

Third, the interviewed relocatees differed considerably in age and years of schooling from the interviewed nonrelocatees:

	Relocatees	Nonrelocatees
Median age	29.6 years	35.7 years
Median years of schooling	10.6 grades	8.8 grades

The relocatees were placed in high paying positions, reported by the Tuskegee project as averaging $343 per month.[39] The nonrelocatees had an average starting salary, derived from the BSSR follow-up study, of a little less than $250 per month. There was an even wider wage differential at the time of the BSSR follow-up; the employed relocatees averaged $430 per month compared with the nonrelocatees' average wage of $262 per month.[40] In this context it is important to consider that 70 per cent of the relocatees were working in the state of Alabama; that is, although they were Negroes, they were holding well-paying jobs. This strongly suggests that training for Negroes can have an employment payoff in Alabama.

Only one of the 38 relocatees was unemployed at the time of the BSSR follow-up; 12 of the 89 nonrelocatees were unemployed at that time. Training related work was half again as frequent among the relocatees (62% compared with 40%). Union membership was twice as frequent among the relocatees (24% compared with 11%).

We speculate that the relocatees were probably a more select group, better qualified for the high paying positions, than were the nonrelocated trainees. (We have also speculated that the relocated nontrainees were even more selected than the trainees.) Nonetheless, the findings reported above suggest that relocation to another state may give a trainee job experience which, in turn, better qualifies him for jobs in his original home area. Much of the relocation process at Tuskegee seemed to be of this sort: the trainee received a temporary job (we cannot say whether at his discretion or his employer's) and an income while he acquired a work experience usable in Alabama. The acquisition of experience may be an important function of relocation projects for trainees from rural areas and small towns who are initially well-trained.

---

[39] BSSR derives a comparable mean wage, $350.

[40] In actuality the wage distributions are highly skewed and the mean is not particularly informative. According to BSSR data, the median wage for relocatees after relocation was $286 per month; the median wage at the time of the BSSR follow-up was $308.

Tuskegee demonstrated very well that two programs, training and relocation, can be so coordinated as to provide positive results. Administratively the staffs of the two projects shared the work. The trainees experienced a placement with little or no sense of discontinuity from the training.

We asked the trainees whom we interviewed about their job-seeking experience and employment history from the time they left the training project.[41] Their reports, which we will now summarize, can be viewed against the project staff's assessment of the job demand situation:

demand was best for brickmasons and carpenters, good for meat processors, but limited for farm machinery maintenance workers;

the demand for bricklayers and carpenters was sufficient for illiterate but skilled workmen to get placed;

meat processors needed basic education skills, especially arithmetic;

more farm machinery repairmen might have been placed had more of them been willing to leave Alabama or had they been released on the labor market in the fall, the peak of the hiring season.

About half of the trainees we interviewed, 49 per cent, were not placed when the project ended. Thirty four of the 127 said the project gave them no referrals. Very likely some of the trainees who were not referred were those whom the project did not consider qualified. Others undoubtedly found jobs on their own before the staff was able to refer them.

---

[41] The reader should keep in mind that we interviewed 70 per cent of the 180 trainees. Thirty of the 53 trainees not interviewed were no longer in the state of Alabama at the time of the interviews. While we do not have available their demographic characteristics (age, education, etc.), we assume that they were among the younger, better educated trainees. The trainees who were relocated through the labor mobility demonstration represent 30 per cent of the noninterviews, but only 16 per cent of the out-of-state trainees.

Four out of 5 of the farm machinery trainees we interviewed, and 2 out of 3 of those in the other three training occupations, reported that they went to see employers on their own (see Table 27). Half of those in brickmasonry and carpentry found jobs through their own search, as compared to between one-fourth and one-third of those in the other two occupations.

TABLE 27

TRAINEES' OWN JOB DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT,
BY TRAINING OCCUPATION
(In Percentages)

	Number of Trainees	Looked for Job On Own	Found Job On Own
Brickmasonry	(37)	68	51
Carpentry	(28)	64	46
Farm machinery maintenance	(36)	81	28
Meat processing	(25)	64	32

Trainees in farm machinery maintenance and carpentry were apparently given fewer referrals to employers by the project staff then were trainees in the other occupation categories. Those in farm machinery maintenance were least likely to have had any referrals either to employers or to the employment service (see Table 28). The staff had developed employment referrals for 3 out of 4 of those in brickmasonry, 2 out of 3 of those in carpentry and meat processing, and a little over half of those in farm machinery maintenance.

TABLE 28

JOB AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE REFERRALS BY TRAINING OCCUPATION (In Percentages)

	Brick-masonry N=37	Carpentry N=28	Farm Machinery Maintenance N=36	Meat Processing N=25
Project referred to employer(s) and to Employment Service	62	39	42	56
Project gave only employer referrals	11	22	17	12
Subtotal	73	61	59	68
Project only referred to Employment Service	5	18	5	8
Project neither gave names nor referred to Employment Service	22	21	36	24
Subtotal	27	39	41	32
Total	100	100	100	100

At the time the project ended two of the trainees we interviewed had found jobs through the Employment Service (one of these had also found a job on his own), 10 were offered jobs both as a result of their own efforts and through project referrals, 14 got jobs only through project referrals, and 39 said they got jobs exclusively through their own efforts.

Only two of those we interviewed said the jobs they were offered were not training-related. Although a fairly large proportion of the men were not placed immediately following training, we found that only 14 of the trainees we interviewed were not working at the time of interview. Five of these had been trained in brickmasonry, 6 in carpentry, and 3 in farm machinery maintenance. None of the meat processors whom we interviewed was without a job at the time.

Those in brickmasonry and carpentry were more likely to be out of work intermittently because of the erratic demand for construction workers. This is demonstrated by the figures in Table 29.

TABLE 29

POSTTRAINING EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE, BY TRAINING OCCUPATION
(In Percentages)

During 6 Months Before Interview	Brick-masonry N=36	Carpentry N=28	Farm Machinery Maintenance N=36	Meat Processing N=24[a]
Employed all the time	56	46	64	75
Out of job no more than 5 weeks at one time	11	4	6	0
Out of job more than 5 weeks at one time	33	50	31	25
Total	100	100	100	100

[a] One trainee did not know how much time was involved. He is not included in the figures.

Among those we interviewed, the men in meat processing had the greatest likelihood of having worked all of the time. Trainees in carpentry had been without work for especially long periods of time. They had been less well off when they came into training, and some of them appear to have carried their handicaps with them into their new occupation. They were, however, along with the brickmasonry trainees, earning a higher hourly wage than the meat processors and maintenance men. Two out of 5 brickmasons reported making

$3.25 or more per hour at the time of interview or on the last job before that time. Even though the wage levels in the other training occupations are lower, two-thirds or more of the trainees in each of the other three training occupations reported wage rates of $1.25 or more per hour.

TABLE 30

HOURLY WAGE ON CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB BY TRAINING OCCUPATION (In Percentages)

Hourly Wage	Brick-masonry N=30[a]	Carpentry N=22[a]	Farm Machinery Maintenance N=33[a]	Meat Processing N=23[a]
Under $1.24	10	14	33	31
$1.25-$2.24	27	55	58	65
$2.25-$3.24	23	27	9	4
$3.25 and over	40	4	0	0
Total	100	100	100	100

[a] Excludes those who had been unemployed for 6 months before interview and those who could not say what their hourly rate was.

Undoubtedly this project was successful in giving the majority of the men we talked to a new occupation. A higher proportion were employed than had been employed at the time they applied to training, and the majority were making a higher wage. But one might ask whether their improved situation was due to their having received training or merely a reflection of improved economic conditions. Of course we cannot be sure that any change is attributable to the training; that is, we cannot know that these men would not have changed just as much in the same time period if they had been exposed to no new stimulus. We can, however, draw some inferences from a comparison between the trainees and the applicants who were not trained.

TABLE 31

COMPARISON OF CHANGES IN EMPLOYMENT OF TRAINEES AND APPLICANTS FROM TIME OF APPLICATION TO TIME OF BSSR FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW (In Percentages)

At Time of BSSR Interview	At Time of Application Employed Trainees N=92	 Employed Applicants N=67	 Unemployed Trainees N=35	 Unemployed Applicants N=44
Employed	91	90	80	77
Unemployed	9	10	20	23
Total	100	100	100	100

When we look at Table 31 we find that among both groups almost identical proportions of those out of work when they applied for training were working at the time of interview, and most of the movement was in the direction of increased employment. There were only 8 trainees and 7 applicants who were working at the earlier time and not working when interviewed.

When we talk in terms of steady employment, however, the trainees have a decided advantage over the applicants whom we interviewed (see Table 32).

With respect to rates of pay, exactly the same proportions of both groups, 63 per cent, were receiving higher hourly pay at the second time period.

The data provide little evidence that those who received training were better off than they would have been if they had not been trained: in their increase in steady jobs, according to their own estimates, the trainees are ahead of applicants.

TABLE 32

COMPARISON OF STEADINESS OF EMPLOYMENT AT TIME OF APPLICATION AND TIME OF BSSR INTERVIEW FOR TRAINEES AND APPLICANTS

At Time of BSSR Interview	At Time of Application		
	Steady	Not Steady	Don't Know
Trainees			
Steady	47	22	-
Not steady	6	6	2
Don't know	-	-	-
Applicants			
Steady	27	8	1
Not steady	5	8	1
Don't know	-	-	-

Of course we cannot know whether the trainees would have been able to keep pace with the applicants if they had not had the advantage of training. It is also possible that at another point in time one group would outdo the other. For example, in a period of increased unemployment or recession, the trainees might stand up better than those who had no training. Considering that the applicants tended to be younger and better educated than the trainees the most conservative conclusion is that the applicants fared no better than the trainees; the more favorable conclusion is that the trainees benefited from the training.

Earlier we cited the staff report which noted that each of three characteristics of the trainees had been found to be associated with high achievement as measured by ratings and by a series of tests given in their basic education and job training classes. Those over 35 who were married and (except for those in farm machinery maintenance) resident on campus excelled. Now we want to ask whether these traits were also associated with success in the job market.[42]

To do so we gave each trainee a score of from zero to three on the traits the project found to be associated with trainee success. Because nonresidents in the farm machinery class had higher I.Q.'s and got better test scores than did residents, we gave a point to nonresident trainees in farm machinery, and gave a point to residents in the other three fields. Each trainee also received a point for being over 35 and another for being married and living with his spouse. Then we looked to see if those with more of these traits had done any better in the job market than those who had fewer or none of the traits. The resulting data would indicate that there is either no correlation or a negative one between having the traits associated with success in class, and success in the job market (see Table 33).

---

[42] The mode of analysis which follows and that used by the project in its final report differ. We have used a procedure which assumes that the effects of the three characteristics are additive. The "hypothesis" is that those trainees who possess more of these traits will be more "successful" than those who possess fewer of them. The analysis provided by the project staff treats each of the characteristics independently and does not consider the effects of the possible interrelations. Two other points with respect to the project's analysis (Vol. II) must be raised:

Over-all effects of residence are not profound. (See Table 24 of the project report; also, Tables 48-53 suggest that residence is related to to test scores only for two of the training occupations; it is inversely related for a third training occupation and unrelated for the fourth.)

There are discrepancies among tables in the numbers of trainees in residence. Table 6, for example, gives 81 in residence and 85 commuters. Tables 25-45 give 85 in residence and 81 commuters. These inconsistencies may be clerical errors, of course.

TABLE 33

SUCCESS IN JOB MARKET BY TRAINEE POSSESSION OF TRAITS FOUND TO BE RELATED TO SUCCESS WHILE IN TRAINING
(In Percentages)

	Trainee Had[a]			
	Three Traits[b] N=15	Two Traits[c] N=66	One Traits[d] N=40	None of The Three[e] N=6
Unemployed at time of interview	-	17	8	-
Out of job any time 6 months before interview	27	50	35	17
Job at time of interview regarded as steady	87	71	85	83
Under $1.25 hourly pay when began posttraining employment	40	25	26	17
Believes he has reasonable chance of promotion	40	33	42	67

[a] Scored as follows:

[b] Being married and living with spouse.

[c] Being over 35 years of age.

[d] For trainees in brickmasonry, carpentry and meat processing, being resident on campus.

[e] For trainees in farm machinery maintenance, being a commuter.

Those who had all the plus qualities were exceptionally poorly paid. In most of the characteristics outlined in Table 33 they are not necessarily better off than those who had none. If we compare only the two middle columns of figures where the numbers of cases enhance the reliability of analysis, we see that those with two traits are consistently worse off than those with one.

What explanations can we offer for this apparent paradox that the trainees who performed best in school did least well in the job market? We suggest that significantly different demands were made on them in the two situations and that trainees who were strongly motivated in the one setting were somewhat less so in the other. If each individual's scores on the academic tests could be directly related to his employment outcome one might learn more about the dynamics of these cross cutting influences. Another alternative is that the project's analysis does not direct itself to the possibility that the characteristics may not have joint predictive value. The BSSR data suggest that, in addition to quality of training, age and immediate posttraining job experience are probably better predictors of long-term job outcome than personal characteristics or behavior during training.

Summary and Conclusions

Undoubtedly job development should have been started earlier. The project staff agreed; in fact, they said they thought in retrospect that "employer education" should begin when training begins. Very likely a greater number of the trainees would have been placed in Alabama if the staff had not been pressed for time at the end of the training period. During the last two months or so an intensive effort was made and many jobs were developed. Of course, all the trainees had received counseling about how to get a job, and possibly the staff should be given some credit for the placements that trainees effected on their own.[43] All but two of the trainees we talked to said the jobs they got when training ended were training-related--

---

[43] The project staff told the trainees not to call themselves "Tuskegee graduates." A number of the trainees misunderstood the staff's intention, judging from the follow-up interviews. They understood the request to mean not to tell about having been trained!

an exceptionally high proportion. Quite clearly the Employment Service was not helpful; only two trainees said they got job offers through that channel.[44]

As a group the trainees we interviewed were better off after training than they had been at the time they applied, but so were the applicants who did not receive training. Only in terms of increased steadiness of jobs did the trainees appear to have gone ahead of the applicants.

The staff had reported that certain characteristics of the trainees were associated with being rated highly by teachers or with having achieved better test scores while in training. The older, married men did better on the whole. Residents in all fields but farm machinery maintenance also excelled. But the trainees we interviewed who had the traits associated with success in class apparently did less well in the job market than the other trainees.

---

[44] For more details concerning the role of the Employment Service in job development see BSSR's Interim Report to OMAT, Number 2. The lack of participation on the part of ES was due, according to information given BSSR, to a mutual understanding by both parties that the placement effort would be handled primarily by the project staff. ES personnel, both state and local, were said to have cooperated closely and unofficially with project staff in other ways and there was no indication that any lack of good feeling existed between the two groups. It must be remembered that at that time in the state of Alabama overt interracial cooperation was not encouraged or politically expedient for state employees. The arrangement specified in the contract was not a realistic one.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

We appraise the outcomes of the Tuskegee Institute project as generally excellent. The quality of training, as evaluated by the BSSR Study Team, the astute and candid project staff[45] and by the trainees, was generally excellent. One year was available for training; the project filled the time available with opportunities for the trainees to develop their skills in breadth and in depth. The outcome, for many trainees, was a high level of occupational competence, reflected in their high rates of employment, training-related employment, and after-training wage levels.

In the course of this report we have drawn attention to incongruities and problems the staff faced in the conduct of the project. Before enumerating recommendations growing out of the rich experience of the project, we wish to draw attention again to some of the problems over which the staff had limited control.

1. The project's supply of consultants, advisors and coparticipants was not an appropriate substitute for its own lack of specialized personnel, especially during the first half year. Too many appraisals were given by some consultants, who in the short run, wore two "hats," one as a technical advisor to the project, the other as a project monitor for OMPER. One technical consultant was "shocked" by behavior he observed on campus (not of trainees) which he considered to be immoral. BSSR cannot help but wonder

---

[45] The project staff, in particular the second Associate Director, were keen observers who were willing to be self-critical. Observational "keenness" is indicated by the frequency with which staff observations corresponded with trainees' reports.

whether his appraisal of the project to OMPER represented his technical competence or his personal moral standards. It appears that State Education Agency personnel may have provided much more guidance to the project than did Federal representatives. On the other hand, the project had too little assistance from persons competent in the area of job development and placement.

Over the lifetime of the project the staff had to--and did--develop its own competence in the several facets which, together, represent a comprehensive program.

The Tuskegee experience suggests that the functions of consultation and monitoring, for OMPER, may best be carried out by a team of specialists whose functions are explicit. The team is suggested as a means to reduce the influence of individuals who may report to OMPER negative evaluations based upon observations of debatable relevance. The team approach is suggested also as an aid in conceiving of the project, not in a segmented fashion but as some kind of integrated, interrelated entity.

Perhaps OMAT should have insisted that the project be staffed with specialists, in educational administration and curriculum, testing, etc., drawn from Tuskegee's own staff and provided the necessary funds. Tuskegee under pressure, was able to staff the project with competent persons, but this staffing pattern was not necessarily part of the original project design.

2. The social situation in Alabama had an effect upon recruitment. The staff reported that the failure to recruit the most deprived citizens was in part due to the inability of many men to detach themselves from dependency relationships associated with and underlying their poverty. Some poor Negroes may also have been fearful that retribution would be exacted if they attempted to improve their situation. The staff was critical of its own recruitment program because it failed to reach the hard core, but one might ask whether they could be expected to achieve fully the initial goals

in the milieu in which they functioned. In view of the existing racial tension, it is praiseworthy that Tuskegee Institute was able to offer a program designed to improve the situation of deprived Negroes without generating the sorts of obstructions that would negate its goals.

3. The staff found it difficult to recruit teachers who knew the problems of deprived adults. Many well-qualified persons would not relocate on short notice for a 13-month period. Presumably projects such as this one are located at universities because of the availability of teaching staff and equipment. But the staff observed that a good college teacher is not necessarily a good teacher for hard core trainees, and they went outside the Institute to get most of their teachers. This suggests that a project staff should be allowed a longer period of time in which to look for staff, and that there be some sort of assurance of longer term employment for those who are willing to relocate. Presumably the accumulation of knowledge and techniques for working with deprived adults is in itself a valuable asset to the project and to society. It might be desirable to consider giving teachers some assurance of continuity in their efforts so that the best-qualified ones can be recruited and their accumulated expertise be made use of in future endeavors.

4. If trainees were given financial support during a designated, placement period it might greatly facilitate the staff's efforts. Job development was imaginative but it began too late in the training year. Part of the delay is attributable to the unwillingness of the Employment Service to carry out its original agreement to develop the necessary jobs. No doubt it is unrealistic to expect that all of a project's graduates can be placed in jobs beginning the day after training ends. All trainees but one did get jobs by the time of the BSSR follow-up. The crux of the matter is

still the employment market. If there is high demand for workers in a given occupation, the individuals will be able to become employed by themselves or with assistance. If there is little demand, all of the graduates cannot be placed. With the exception of farm machinery maintenance, training was offered in occupations of high demand.

5. It is eminently reasonable that trainees should be allowed, for example, to choose the kind of training they want, as it is that residence on the campus should be determined by distance from the training site. But if trainees in different groups are not matched, it is impossible to say that outcome is related to differential stimulus associated with one experience as opposed to another. The Tuskegee staff members were probably not unaware of these problems, although their final report does not take them into full account. Evaluation of experimental features demands conformity to experimental research design. But to impose an experimental design might have other consequences, such as, in this case, assigning trainees to job training, rather than letting them choose their fields, or assigning trainees to dormitories without regard to the distance from home to school. In view of the difficulty that the project experienced in recruiting trainees who met all the criteria of eligibility, it seems most unlikely that even with the best advice on research methodology a true experimental design could have been imposed. True experiments usually have no other immediate purpose than that of adding to scientific knowledge, which then may be applied in another situation. Because the project supposedly had other goals, preeminently that of retraining and placement of adults in occupations they will find satisfying and rewarding, imposition of an experimental design might have obstructed achievement of the training goals.

Despite the difficulties of incorporating experimental designs into action programs, it would seem to be desirable to have an expert on research design available on a consultant basis from the time the project proposal is being planned, to take maximum advantage of any available opportunities for evaluation of the experimental design.

Recommendations

1. Recruitment.--The finding that high school graduates reported total pretraining annual incomes no higher than those who stopped at the 8th grade and lower than those who dropped out of high school suggests, at least for this locality, that eligibility requirements based on level of education may not be appropriate. Indeed, such criteria appear to discriminate against needy high school graduates.

2. Training period.--The length of training generally was appropriate to qualify most trainees for employment. Some trainees, according to the project staff, reached a suitable level of competence in nine months; other trainees--the staff estimated about 10-15 per cent--required a longer period of training, perhaps up to two years to realize their potential. Contracts should be written and programs designed to provide some flexibility in length of training time.

BSSR speculates that training time generally might be decreased through the continuous provision of an optimal learning situation which would include residence on campus, and integration into campus life, continuous counseling, and a well conceived and coordinated program supplemented by additional individualized remedial education for the less able.

3. Choice of training occupation.--Trainees were permitted to choose their own training occupations; no aptitude tests were used. The extent to which choice of job training was related to trainee characteristics

such as age, previous job experience, pretraining income, steadiness of previous employment, and language fluency, suggests that self-selection of training area may be a viable procedure.

4. Conduct of training.--A feature of the training routine found useful in placing trainees, that also appeared helpful in conditioning them to the world of work, was the requirement that they punch a time clock. Prospective employers were interested in a trainee's record of absenteeism, considering it an indicator of future dependability on the job.

5. Family counseling.--Although the original proposal called for family counseling it was not provided. The Associate Director felt it was very necessary. As he put it:

> You cannot train one half of the household and leave the other half untrained or uncounseled. You run into a situation which brings about conflicts in the family . . . The wives apparently expect that the men can move mountains after one year of training here. They expect their earning power should be such that they can renovate the entire family in terms of sending the children to better schools, in terms of giving the wives an opportunity to go to school, etc. I am not of the opinion that these men can do that--not at this stage.

6. Teacher training.--Teachers who have had no prior experience with the adult poor should receive at least four weeks of instruction before training begins, and must receive continuous supervision during the course of the training. The training must be directed by a competent adult educator; part-time consultants cannot provide the day-by-day adjustments a project requires. ✓

7. Project organization.--The division of project responsibilities between Director and Assistant Director, with the Director providing liason with state agencies and the Assistant Director concerned primarily with interproject coordination and conduct of training, was found to be highly effective and could serve as a model for other similar projects. ✓

8. Project direction.--Tuskegee's experience suggests that the problem of the undersupply of competent teachers might be ameliorated by the presence on the staff of one competent person to direct the program and to supervise the instructors. It may be less difficult to locate on a college campus one of the latter than nine or more of the former. It should be noted that supervising teachers within each area, an arrangement Tuskegee reported using, is not a substitute for an over-all director and supervisor of the educational program. The latter's major responsibility may well be to make the several training aspects, basic education, skill training, and counseling, coalesce to provide the trainee with an integrated--and total--experience. In the instance of Tuskegee it was found that a professional educator in the field of adult education was able to carry out these responsibilities with considerable success.

9. Work experience.--There should be some provision to make it possible for trainees to acquire a work record. Without job experience Negroes in Alabama are at a very great disadvantage in the labor market. On-the-job training following institutional training is one possibility. A labor mobility project following institutional training is another possibility.

10. Job development and placement.--At least two persons should be working on job development from the time the project begins. A problem, particularly acute in the South, that of educating employers to employ Negroes, makes job development difficult and time-consuming. Among the "extracurricular" trainee characteristics found to be of interest to employers in this locality were trainee credit ratings, absentee records, physical fitness, history of civil rights activity and taste for alcohol.

11. Income maintenance before placement.--It should be expected that job placement in Alabama and some other southern states will continue to be difficult and time-consuming. Continued financial support of the trainee during the job placement phase of the project seems indicated. Continuing support contingent upon the trainee's search for a job may facilitate placement. Funds to enable trainees, with staff members in some cases, to travel to job interviews at places removed both from the training site and from the trainees' homes are a necessity. They may also provide the hardest core with the incentive to forego their economic "security" to enter training.

In a conventional educational program completion of the course is the termination of the process. OMPER must decide whether an MDTA educational program is completed at the end of training or at placement. If placement is the end of the training there must be some provision for income maintenance for a short period, say, up to two or three months, following training. Any income device must be understood by the project staff and by the trainee to represent support to accomplish placement. The support should stop with the placement.

12. Other recommendations.--The Tuskegee project staff noted to BSSR a number of other areas their experience suggested needed program remediation. These included the need to provide:

a) psychiatric services;

b) individualized attention and instruction for the lowest performers among the trainees; and,

c) intensive financial or budgeting counseling.